CH'AN ENLIGHTENMENT FOR LAYMEN: TA-HUI AND THE NEW RELIGIOUS CULTURE OF THE SUNG

a thesis presented

by

Miriam Lindsey Levering

to

The Committee on the Study of Religion

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the subject of

Comparative Religion

Harvard University

Cambridge, Massachusetts

April, 1978

Acknowledgments

The teachings and writings of Dr. Wilfred Cantwell Smith inspired the writer in 1968 to undertake the difficult and rewarding study of Chinese religious life. The writer's interest in Ch'an Buddhism and Neo-Confucianism began in Taiwan on a Harvard Travelling Fellowship in 1969-70. Work on this thesis was begun in 1973-74 while the writer was a student at the Inter-university Center for Japanese Language Studies in Tokyo. An NEH Fellowship made that year of study possible. During that year the writer received invaluable assistance and guidance from the staff of the Inter-university Center, from Prof. Ishii Shūdō of Komazawa University, Prof. Kamata Shigeo of the Tokyo University Tōyō Bunka Kenkyujō, Prof. Iriya Yoshitaka of Kyoto University, and the Research Institute of Rissho Kosei-kai. The writer wishes to give special thanks to Prof. Ishii and to Yasuo and Kiyoe Sugimoto, whose guidance and friendship during that period made this work possible.

From 1974 to 1976, the writer received valuable assistance from the faculty and staff associated with the Center for the Study of World Religion at Harvard University, and in particular from a visiting scholar at the Center, the Rev. Yung-bong Oh. The thoughtful encouragement and criticism of Profs. Masatoshi Nagatomi and John Carman of Harvard University has from its beginnings shaped this work in ways great and small; the writer's debt of gratitude to these wise and humane teachers is incalculable. Prof. Lien-sheng Yang patiently read through a hundred pages of the writer's translations from Ta-hui's writings, and Prof. Victor Mair kindly read a semi-final draft.

Lyn Boone and Linda Michalson helped prepare the final draft for typing. Linda Clarke of the Steonographic Services Office of Oberlin College and Karen Blank of Oberlin, Ohio typed the final version. Vivian Hsü and Pearl Lin wrote the characters. Finally, the writer's parents, Wilton J. and Carolyn L. Lindsey, provided material and moral support at every stage, and largely shared the burden of typing and proofreading the various drafts. Without their valuable assistance, this work might never have been completed.

Notes on Style

1. I have chosen to distinguish between two types of parenthetical material included within translations. The first type consists of words which are implied but not expressed in the original and are needed to make the sentence complete in English. Such words and phrases I have placed in brackets. The second type consists of appositional explanations of the meaning of translated words and phrases. Rather than placing these in the footnotes, I have placed them within the body of the translations and enclosed them in parentheses.

2. The Romanization of Chinese follows the Wade-Giles system.

3. Chinese characters for names and terms are usually (but not always) provided at the first occurance of the name or term in the text. Chinese characters *may* be provided at second or later occurances. Chinese characters are usually not provided in the footnotes. Chinese characters for names of persons, places, schools and concepts can be found in the glossary at the end of the thesis. Names of authors and texts will be found only in the bibliography.

4. Some technical terms are capitalized in Chinese and/or English translation (e.g., *li* as Principle, *hsing* as Nature) to differentiate them from other homophonous terms in Chinese and from their meaning in ordinary English usage, or, on the analogy of God or "Supreme Being," to indicate that they are seen as ontic or cosmic powers.

5. Some common Sanskrit words, such as Mahāyāna, sūtra, Nirvāṇa, Prajñā and others, are not italicized; also, Chinese words are not italicized when they form part of a proper noun (e.g., Hua-yen Tsung, Ch'an, and others).

6. I have capitalized the names of sermon forms in Chapter V. To be consistent, I have used the same capitalized form when the name of a sermon form forms part of a title, as in <u>Ta-hui P'u Shuo</u>.

Abbreviations

JIBS — *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 (*Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*).

HJAS — *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*.

Letters — Araki Kengo 荒木見悟, ed. and trans. *Daie sho* 大慧書 *Zen no goroku* 禪の語錄, XVII. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1969.

Nien-p'u — *Ta-hui P'u-chueh Ch'an-shih nien-p'u* 大慧普覺禪師年譜. *Shukuzōkyō*, *T'eng* 8, pp. 1a-16a.

P'u Shuo — *Ta-hui P'u-chueh Ch'an-shih P'u Shuo* 大慧普覺禪師普說. *Zokuzōkyō* 1, 31, 5, pp. 395a-509b.

Shukuzōkyō or Shukusatsu-zōkyō — *Dai-Nihon kōtei daizōkyō* 大日本校定大藏經, printed during the years 1880-1885 by the Kokyo Shoin of Tokyo; known as the Tokyo Tripitaka.

SS — *T'o-t'o* 脫脫 et al., ed. *Sung-shih* 宋史 Sung Dynastic History. Twenty-five Dynastic Histories ed. Shanghai: K'ai-ming Shu-tien, 1934.

SYHA — Huang Tsung-hsi 黃宗羲. *Sung-Yüan hsüeh-an* 宋元學案 (Notes on the Sung and Yüan Schools of Learning). Taipei: Kuang-wen Shu-chü, 1971.

SYHAPI — Wang Tzu-ts'ai 王梓材 and Feng Yün-hao 馮雲濠, comp., Chang Shou-yung 張壽鏞, rev. *Sung-Yüan hsüeh-an p'u-i* 宋元學案補遺 (Corrections of Omissions in "Notes on the Sung and Yüan Schools of Learning"). Ssu-ming ts'ung-shü edition. Taipei: Shih-chieh Shu-chü, 1967.

Taishō — *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經. Printed during the years 1922-1933.

ZGI — Nishitani Keiji 西谷啓治 and Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, eds., *Zenke goroku* 禪家語錄, I. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1972.

Zokuzōkyō 1 — *Nihon kōtei daizōkyō* 日本校定大藏經. Printed during the years 1902-1905 by the Zokyo Shoin of Kyoto; known also as the *Manji zōkyō* and as the Kyoto Tripitaka.

Zokuzōkyō 2

Dai-Nihon zokuzōkyō 大日本續藏經. A supplement to the Nihon kōtei daizōkyō printed from 1905-1912. Reprinted by the Shanghai Commercial Press in 1923.

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Chapter I. Ta-hui's Life 18

A. Early years and experience with Ch'an teachers

B. Enlightenment and national prominence

C. Exile and return

D. Politics in the early Southern Sung

E. Ta-hui and the anti-peace party

Chapter II. Ta-hui and Confucian Teachings: Tao-hsüeh 63

A. Sung Confucians and Tao-hsüeh: An historical sketch

B. Ta-hui's disciples and Tao-hsüeh

C. Tao-hsüeh and the Ch'an of Ta-hui: Similarities and differences

D. Evidence of Ta-hui's response to Tao-hsüeh

Chapter III. Ta-hui and Confucian Teachings: Three Teachings Return to One, Part I 103

A. Early history of "Three Teachings thought"

B. "Three Teachings thought" in the Northern Sung

C. Attitudes of Tao-hsüeh scholars toward Buddhism

Chapter IV. Ta-hui and Confucian Teachings: Three Teachings Return to One, Part II 133

A. The Three Teachings and ethics

B. Similarities in essence, differences in function

C. Truth and error in Taoism

D. Ta-hui's lay disciples and the Three Teachings

E. Evaluation and conclusion

Chapter V. Ta-hui and the Institutionalization of the Teaching of Laymen in Sung Ch'an 171

A. A short history of the P'u Shuo form

B. P'u Shuo by Ta-hui's predecessors Yüan-wu and Fo-yen

C. P'u Shuo by Ta-hui's contemporaries

D. Ta-hui's use of the P'u Shuo form

E. A sermon for the dead: The occasion

F. A sermon for the dead: The teaching

Chapter VI. Hua-yen Thought and Lay Practice 207

A. Ta-hui's view of lay practice

B. Evidence of Ta-hui's special interest in the Hua-yen sūtra

C. A brief look at the Hua-yen sūtra and the Hua-yen school

D. Ta-hui and the Hua-yen sūtra

E. Ta-hui and the Hua-yen school

Chapter VII. Hua-t'ou Practice: The Need for Hua-t'ou 240

A. Ta-hui's emphasis on hua-t'ou practice

B. Misguided education: Scholar-official "rationality" and Ch'an practice

C. The errors of other Ch'an teachers

Chapter VIII. Faith, Doubt and the Hua-t'ou 283

A. The Hua-yen sūtra and faith

B. The Lin-chi lu and faith

C. Ta-hui's understanding of faith

D. Lin-chi and Ta-hui on doubt

E. Other functions of the hua-t'ou

F. The layman and hua-t'ou practice

Conclusion 312

An Historical Note 315

Appendix A. Discussion of Texts Used 319

Appendix B. Sources for Ta-hui's Biography 326

Appendix C. I. P'u Shuo by Ta-hui's Contemporaries and Juniors 330

II. Contemporaries Included in the Survey for Whom There Were No Recorded P'u Shuo 333

Glossary of Chinese and Japanese Words and Phrases 335

Bibliography 346





Introduction

Like the commonplace son of a great father, Sung Buddhism has received little attention from modern historians of Chinese Buddhism, who have lavished great care upon the study of the Buddhism of the T'ang. Lacking any great scholastic or philosophical movements of its own, Sung Buddhism has seemed to many to represent the beginning of a long period of decline in the fortunes of Chinese Buddhism. The Sung as a whole has long been regarded by historians as a period of great cultural brilliance, but attention has been focused on the creative efforts of writers, artists, politicians and Confucian philosophers. Although Buddhism was unquestionably a greater part of the culture of the time than any other single institution or movement, painters of the richly colored canvas of Sung history have for the most part left the Buddhism of the period draped in shadows.

Specialists in literature and art, Confucianism, politics and economics have often not been inclined or equipped to deal fully with what they have recognized as "the Buddhist influence," or "the Buddhist contribution" to their subjects, and professional historians of Buddhism have concentrated on earlier periods. The result is a largely unexplored terrain between the Buddhism in existence at the time of the last great T'ang persecutions of 845 and the Buddhism observed and recorded by Western residents and travelers in China and the Chinese diaspora from the nineteenth century to the present. Between the mountain peaks of T'ang Buddhism and the lowlands and marshes of the Buddhism of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, what are the shapes

of the Sung Buddhist landscape? What were the important developments characteristic of the Buddhism of the Sung period? What did it contribute to its own time? What were the legacies of Sung Buddhists to the future?

One characteristic of Sung Buddhism was the pre-eminence and great flourishing of Ch'an 禪 Buddhism during this period. Ch'an had arisen during the middle and late T'ang as an avant-garde movement more and more differentiated from the other schools. Gradually developing its own monastic establishment, and its own rules, it had tried to divorce itself from the pattern of Buddhist monasteries which forbade monks to work and which depended for survival on donations of land and treasure from wealthy and influential laymen. Ch'an monks had established the rule that "a day without work was a day without food," requiring monks to work, and had separated themselves from the mainstream of Buddhism, building their monasteries away from the temptations and support offered by major population centers.

In the Northern Sung, however, Ch'an monks were invited to serve as abbots in major monasteries in the capital, and Ch'an suddenly found itself constituting, rather than avoiding, the mainstream of the Buddhist movement. A number of intellectuals and artists had always found Ch'an attractive and inspiring; in the Sung the trickle of educated laymen who turned to Ch'an for challenge, solace and inspiration became a cataract, and Sung Ch'an found itself teaching and performing services for laymen to a degree never seen before. At the same time the court took over control of a number of large Ch'an monasteries, which became places of prayer for the dynasty. Philosophical schools such as the

Hua-yen Tsung 華嚴宗 , which after 845 found it difficult to maintain an independent or creative existence, almost disappeared as separate entities, but their teachings continued to be studied and read in Ch'an monasteries. With very few exceptions the outstanding Buddhist figures of the Sung period were Ch'an teachers. In time Ch'an became so popular that a period of Ch'an study was almost de rigeur for an educated layman.

In this period of dominance of the Ch'an school, and of the tendency toward eclecticism and amalgamation of the T'ang schools within this school, the Ch'an teacher Ta-hui Tsung-kao 大慧宗杲 was one of the four or five outstanding Ch'an teachers, and one of the figures most representative of the strengths and weaknesses of Sung Buddhism.

The study of the career and teachings of Ta-hui Tsung-kao can reward one with insight into some of the major and most characteristic features of Sung Buddhism. In combination with other studies it will enable future scholars to evaluate more precisely the contributions and developments, positive and negative, of the Buddhism of this period. As was typical of the Buddhists of the period as a whole, Ta-hui stressed practice, not wisdom born of doctrinal study, as the direct and simple means to Buddhahood. As was typical of the Ch'an teachers of the period as a whole, Ta-hui was a conserver and a systematizer of the traditions of his great predecessors in the Ch'an school. As was typical of Ch'an teachers of his generation, Ta-hui accepted the new position of the Ch'an school and the Ch'an teacher as the bearer of the whole Chinese Buddhist tradition; he was willing to employ every resource of the Chinese Buddhist tradition to respond, as abbots of important monasteries in other schools had done in the past, to a wide variety of lay and national needs.

A firm believer in Ch'an transmission from mind to mind apart from doctrine, Ta-hui nevertheless took a considerable if secondary interest in sūtra literature and scholastic doctrinal commentaries, particularly those connected with the Hua-yen (Avataṃsaka) sūtra. He also felt strongly, as some had before and many would after him, that the truth realized in enlightenment was also taught in the other two major traditions in which educated persons were interested, Taoism and Confucianism. Most significant and most fateful of all, Ta-hui as a Ch'an teacher was interested in promoting the enlightenment of laymen, and especially of educated laymen, scholars and officials and their families. Ta-hui contributed deliberately and effectively to the effort to assure that Ch'an Buddhism played a major role in shaping the culture and experience of educated persons in the Sung.

In this study we shall examine in some detail the major events in Ta-hui's career, and the characteristic features and contributions of his teaching, in the context of the most characteristic and significant feature of all, his contribution to a growing rapprochement between the austere and single-minded Ch'an monastic teaching and practice and the spiritual and intellectual needs of Buddhist laymen. Seen together from this perspective, all of the characteristic features which Ta-hui shared with or contributed to the Ch'an Buddhism of his time can be seen to be related wholly or in part to his desire to bring laymen, particularly scholar-officials, to enlightenment.

In Buddhism one traditionally finds the view that there are two kinds of practice on the path to liberation from the endless cycle of birth and death. The first kind of practice consists of meditation and

the cultivation of wisdom that leads to enlightenment or Buddhahood; this kind of practice is primarily pursued by monks. The second kind of practice consists of faith and devotion, and of desisting from bad actions and performing good ones so as to improve one's future states of being and make possible future opportunities to become a monk to pursue the first kind of practice toward enlightenment. This second kind of practice is primarily pursued by laymen. In the Buddhism of the Sung dynasty in China, however, we find this division between monastic and lay practice to a certain extent overcome. Laymen demanded that their practice go beyond the expression of faith and the performance of good actions, that they too be taught about the "monastic" practice that leads to enlightenment, and that their spiritual needs be served by the monastic institutions which they had so long served as donors. Monastic teachers likewise sought to enable layman to understand and profit from the highest level of teaching, so that they too might reach enlightenment. This development, one of the most important characteristics of Sung Buddhism, was also one of its chief legacies to the future. This trend toward overcoming the traditional distinction between monastic and lay practice is nowhere more evident than in the career and teaching of Ta-hui.

The most evident sign of Ta-hui's marked willingness to further this rapprochement is his interest in addressing the immediate spiritual and emotional concerns of laymen in the letters he wrote to them and the sermons he gave for their benefit. In these letters and sermons Ta-hui was able to show laymen how a new understanding of their emotional and spiritual states, such as grief, would enable them to see these

states as opportunities to make progress in Ch'an practice toward enlightenment.

Other notable aspects of Ta-hui's teachings, such as his spirited defense of the necessity of a moment of awakening (wu, 悟 satori) as the beginning of true Ch'an practice, and his insistence that hua-t'ou 話頭 or kung-an 公案 (kōan) practice was superior to all other current forms of Ch'an practice, can be shown to be related at least in part to his belief that laymen can reach enlightenment in daily life and to his specific desire to enable them to do so. He believed strongly that hua-t'ou practice toward a moment of awakening was not only the most effective means to enlightenment, it was also the one means that laymen could practice successfully in the midst of their usual activities. Ta-hui's doctrinal emphases and formulations, such as his frequent emphasis on truths associated with the Hua-yen ching (Avataṃsaka sūtra) and the Chinese philosophical school of Hua-yen can also be seen in part as a framework of ideas which supported his desire to show laymen that they too can reach enlightenment.

These aspects of Ta-hui's teaching are shaped by his desire to teach laymen. Other aspects reflect the fact that the laymen he was particularly concerned to reach were scholar-officials (shih-tai-fu 士大夫), men who had been educated in the Confucian tradition and who had chosen lives of public responsibility.

Scholar-officials, the small elite group of educated men from whom administrators, judges, policy-makers and teachers of the Chinese empire were drawn, occupied a special place in Chinese society. Their unique character as an elite can be said to have begun in the Sung

dynasty when the examination system, and thus education itself, became more important as a means of entrance into the governmental bureaucracy. Although the examination system had existed in the T'ang, it was not nearly as important as a road to power and influence during that period as it was to become during the Sung.[1] The Northern Sung period (960-1126) had seen an enormous commercial, agricultural and industrial "revolution" in China, and was a period of startling growth in trade and industry and growth in the importance of a money economy.[2] The Northern

---

1. E.A. Kracke, Jr., Civil Service in Early Sung China, 960-1067 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953). Kracke also discusses the importance of the chin-shih 進士 route into the bureaucracy in "Family vs. Merit in Chinese Civil Service Examinations Under the Empire," HJAS, X (1947), pp. 103-23. He estimates that chin-shih graduates supplied 37-44% of the civil servants between 1142 and 1172, and a major percentage of those who held the higher positions. Brian E. McKnight's data strongly support the view that the upper levels of Sung government were dominated by degree-holders ("Administrators of Hangchow under the Northern Sung: A Case Study," HJAS, XXX [1970], p. 205).

2. The commercial, industrial and agricultural revolution between the middle of the T'ang and the end of the Sung has been much studied in recent years by Japanese and Western scholars. One of the most valuable studies available in English is that of Shiba Yoshinobu, Commerce and Society in Sung China, Michigan Abstracts of Chinese and Japanese Works on Chinese History, No. 2, trans. by Mark Elvin (Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan, 1970). Still one of the most valuable short treatments of the subject is E.A. Kracke, Jr., "Sung Society: Change within Tradition," Far Eastern Quarterly, XIV (1955), pp. 479-88. Scholars agree that the period saw the development of region-wide markets, an increasingly sophisticated money economy using copper coin and paper money, regional agricultural specialization, specialization in crops for sale, the development of new crops, the development of facilities for the transfer of funds over distances, the development of instruments of credit. Certain industries such as the iron industry developed on a remarkable scale. Merchants were to some extent liberated from the close official supervision that had existed during the T'ang. Cities grew rapidly along trade routes, reflecting the new growth of national markets for some products. Smaller cities and towns grew and multiplied. The growth of commerce and the money economy made the earlier system of self-sufficient estates outdated. In the early T'ang the pattern had been that the government opposed

Sung had seen the creation of a great number of families with "new money,"[1] a change in the center of economic, cultural, and political importance of the country from the north to the south,[2] and a revolution in the system of land-holding that broke up the T'ang system of large estates in the hands of a small number of "aristocratic" families and made way for a new and much larger "bureaucratic" elite drawn from

---

private holdings of land, and leased the publically held land to the peasants to farm. Some large landholders had the power to defy this system and were able to hold large estates tax-free. These "aristocrats" had an independent power base in their estates and their retainers. (This is of course oversimplified, as Denis Twitchett points out in his discussion of data in the Tun-huang materials in "Chinese Social History from the Seventh to the Tenth Centuries," Past and Present, No. 35 [Dec. 1966], pp. 28-53.) In the Sung the government no longer opposed the private holding of land, and consequently it no longer took exceptional power to protect private holdings. A new tax system made it hard for aristocrats to avoid taxes. Peasants changed from hereditary retainers to tenant farmers. Landowning no longer brought military power or influence in the government. For an account of life in a Southern Sung city, see Jacques Gernet, Daily Life in China on the Eve of the Mongol Invasion (New York: The Macmillian Co., 1962).

1. Kracke, Civil Service in Early Sung China, p. 14.

2. The change of the political and economic center of the country from the north to the south was first pointed out by Kuwabara Jitsuzo (Cf. Hisayuki Miyakawa, "An Outline of the Naito Hypothesis and its Effects on Japanese Studies of China," Far Eastern Quarterly, XIV [1954-55], pp. 533-34). It is now accepted by all scholars of the Sung. Kracke ("Sung Society," pp. 479-80) details the population shift from north to south: in 750 the south had 40-45% of China's population. In 1290 the south had 85-90% of the population. Twenty percent was in Fukien and Chekiang alone. During the Sung the south supplied food and agricultural products to the north, in return for products of mining and manufacturing. Trade with Southeast Asia enriched Kwangtung and Fukien. The south's dominance of the civil service examinations is discussed by Kracke in "Region, Family and Individual in the Chinese Examination System," in Chinese Thought and Institutions, ed. by J.K. Fairbank (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), pp. 251-68.

"commercial" as well as "aristocratic" sources.[1] The aristocracy which had most of the decision-making power in the T'ang gave way to a stronger emperor who presided over a scholar-official bureaucracy.[2] The bureaucracy had much influence and little independent power; its members had come into office through an examination system open to most strata of society, rather than through the possession of landed estates, and consequently owed their power to their education and to the emperor

---

1. Kracke's study ("Family vs. Merit," pp. 114-116) found that between 50 and 60% of the successful doctoral candidates in 1184 and 1256 came from families that had produced no civil servants for three generations, that is, from the candidate's great-grandfather on. There is some evidence that merchants were excluded in theory from civil service exams; for example, Sung-shih, chüan 155 says that artisans and merchants were not qualified for the chin-shih exam. On the other hand, there is also evidence that they were not entirely excluded. They did enter the civil service by other means; for example, in times of emergency persons who contributed a certain amount of grain received official titles. Cf. Kracke, Civil Service in Early Sung China, pp. 69-70 and 76; and Ch'u T'ung-tsu, "Chinese Class Structure and Its Ideology," in Chinese Thought and Institutions, ed. by J.K. Fairbank, pp. 235-50 and 384-88.

2. Historians differ on the question of the sense in which it is meaningful to say that the Sung emperor was strong. The famous "Naitō hypothesis" suggested that the decay of the aristocracy in the late T'ang and in the Sung was accompanied by a rise of imperial despotism: whereas the T'ang emperor was at the mercy of the powerful aristocrats, the Sung emperor could control his ministers, who, as scholar-officials with no independent base of power, governed at his pleasure. (On the Naitō hypothesis, in English see Hisayuki Miyakawa, "An Outline of the Naitō hypothesis and its Effects on Japanese Studies of China.") There is no question but that the emperor during the Sung was an "executive emperor"; he took responsibility for all decisions, and none could be made without his consent. Ministers definitely served at his pleasure. However, Kracke argues that the Northern Sung emperors accepted greater restraints on their power. The emperor, says Kracke, "could not afford to act in a way that would antagonize the bulk of the officialdom, on whom his power depended" (Civil Service in Early Sung China, pp. 28-30). The case of the emperor Kao Tsung's support of Ch'in Kuei and the peace faction discussed in Chapter I below shows the extraordinary power of the emperor who was able to allow the vast majority of his experienced officials to be exiled, and the weak position he found himself in when he allowed one faction to eliminate the other.

himself.[1] It was against this background that a new self-confident, highly talented and for the most part widely tolerant scholar-official (shih-tai-fu) culture was born in the Northern Sung, a culture that placed a great emphasis on education and the intellectual solution of political problems.

Scholar-officials were, for the most part, optimistic about their ability to plumb the profundities of all of the strands of the various Chinese traditions. They proclaimed their own age a renaissance in Confucian learning, and explored with great speculative and synthetic interest the mysteries taught in Taoist texts, in the I Ching 易經 and in Buddhism. Ch'an Buddhism, the most aesthetically and intellectually tantalizing of the Buddhist traditions, attracted many of the elite.

---

1. Cf. footnote 1, p. 7; footnotes 1 and 2 on p. 9.
Kracke says: "It was also in this period that new recruitment procedures opened up a governmental career to far wider numbers than before. Competitive recruitment examinations were regularly used from the beginning of the eleventh century on a scale far greater than ever before. Improved through the development of elaborate techniques to make the examination more objective, the new system helped to break the power monopoly once held by a small group of northern aristocratic families....Several hundred candidates commonly passed the final stage of the triennial examinations, and we are told that for each of these, some hundred candidates had attempted the local preliminary tests. The competition was wide indeed. But the fiercest rivalry and the most numerous successful candidates during most of the dynasty came from the southeast coast, where we have seen the rapid pace of urbanization at this time. [This suggests] a seeming link between the broad social base of the bureaucracy and the social mobility that probably characterized the great cities in their period of most rapid expansion. The largest portion of apparently new blood tended to appear in the circuits of most rapid population growth. Conspicuous among these regions of growing population were again those containing the great coastal cities and those on the main inland trade routes" (Kracke, "Sung Society," pp. 486-87).
Commercial wealth did not constitute an independent base of power for a bureaucrat or minister in the Sung dynasty.

Students of the history of Ch'an Buddhism point to the development in the Sung of a rapprochement between teachers of Ch'an and the scholar-official elite.[1] Ta-hui was one of the handful of Ch'an teachers most responsible for fostering this rapprochement.[2] Not only did Ta-hui count many influential shih-tai-fu among his disciples, he also devoted much of his preaching and writing to addressing the question of why and how shih-tai-fu in particular should practice Ch'an.

One of Ta-hui's contributions to the history of Ch'an thought, and to the broader history of Chinese thought, was his interest in the relation between Buddhist teaching and practice and those of the Confucian and Taoist traditions. Ta-hui's interest in this subject reflects no doubt the concern of his scholar-official hearers to relate the truths of "the three teachings" that formed their world of ideas. More specifically, the particular cast that Ta-hui's understanding of the Confucian tradition took, and his particular evaluation of it, perhaps reflected the concerns of a particular group of Confucian scholar-officials with whom he came into intimate contact, men who had been influenced by the teaching of the Ch'eng brothers and the multi-faceted Tao-hsüeh 道學 movement, and men who strongly opposed the "peace faction" at the early Southern Sung court. The fact that Ta-hui's teaching attracted this group of men created favorable conditions for an exchange of influence and a development of affinities between Ta-hui's Buddhist teachings and the intellectual concerns of his Confucian students.

---

1. Cf. for example Yanagida Seizan, "Chūgoku Zenshū shi," in Nishitani Keiji, ed., Kōza Zen, vol. 3: Zen no rekishi-Chūgoku (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1967), pp. 92-93.

2. Cf. Yanagida, "Chūgoku Zenshū shi," pp. 98-100 and Araki Kengo, Bukkyō to Jukyō (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1962), pp. 194-228.

Ta-hui's interest in teaching Ch'an to laymen, and to scholar-officials in particular, raises important questions for students of Ch'an history. The first is whether lay and monastic practice can in fact be mixed as Ta-hui and others attempted. Is it possible to bring lay students to Ch'an enlightenment? Is it possible to teach monastic and lay students at the same time without prostituting or diluting either the teaching or the practice? Did the efforts of Ta-hui and others to broaden Ch'an practice to include laymen bring about a decline in the quality of teaching, practice, and realization in Sung or later Chinese Buddhism?

Other questions concern the related issue of motive. A simplified picture has been drawn in the minds of most casual and many serious students of the relation between Buddhists and Confucians in the Sung. In this picture, Confucians become at once self-confident, metaphysical, intellectually on the offensive, and concerned with "orthodoxy"; Buddhists, on the other hand, find themselves on the decline and on the defensive, playing elegant aesthetic games with elite laymen or preaching a simple salvation to the masses, taking refuge from aggressive Confucians and their own lack of originality in worldliness and the belief that "all teachings are the same." Were Ch'an masters such as Ta-hui in fact only on the defensive, attempting to "defend their faith" against the attacks of anti-Buddhists or the disparagement of the newly self-confident Confucian elite? Or were they participating in a general movement whose concerns transcended "traditional" boundaries, so that they naturally found themselves sharing the enthusiasm and concerns of lay scholar-officials?

A study of Ta-hui's teaching in relation to laymen will not answer these questions in full. For that we must wait for further studies of the largely unexplored terrain of Sung Ch'an and Sung Buddhism in general. But it is our contention that support will be found for the following theses:

1. That Ta-hui's teachings were affected both in form and in content by his desire to spread the teaching and practice of Ch'an to laymen.

2. That Ta-hui as a Buddhist both was influenced by and exercised influence upon the Neo-Confucian movement in its formative period, in part because the Neo-Confucian movement formed an important element of the culture in which he lived, in part because of his frequent contact with enthusiastic Neo-Confucians, and in part because of his active desire to steer scholar-officials away from certain kinds of intellectual errors that hindered their realization of truth. In Ta-hui's teaching one finds a bit of the flavor of a "defense of the faith" against the Confucian challenge. But in Ta-hui's teaching one also seems to witness a creative interaction among Buddhists and Confucians attempting to forge a new cultural movement based on a deeper understanding of the fundamental similarities between the two traditions.

3. That Ta-hui's insistence on the efficacy of <u>hua-t'ou</u> practice and denunciation of silent illumination practice, and his affinity for the universal version of the <u>Hua-yen sūtra</u>, are related to his desire to reach out to laymen.

Chapter I will summarize briefly the principal events of Ta-hui's life, drawing largely on the Nien-p'u compiled for Ta-hui by Tsu-yung

and published in 1183. In Chapter I we shall also explore the question of Ta-hui's relation to the anti-peace faction at the Southern Sung court, and the larger and more difficult question of whether there is any evidence that Ta-hui himself was involved in politics with his lay friends.

Chapters II, III and IV will support our second thesis in exploring Ta-hui's views of Confucianism, and incidently, Taoism. Chapter II will address the question of whether Ta-hui's understanding of Confucian teachings was similar to that of the particular Confucian movement called "Tao-hsueh." This exploration will shed light on the way in which a configuration of intellectual and cultural issues and presuppositions formed an intellectual climate common to educated Buddhists and Confucians in the early Southern Sung. Ta-Hui's ability to speak to laymen in this period was surely in some measure due to the fact that he was able to relate his teaching to this cultural configuration, and the fact that he attempted to present answers to some of its major issues. We will not attempt to explore the question of the degree to which Ta-hui's teaching was influenced by, or influenced, the thinking of his Tao-hsueh disciples: this would require major new research into writings and intellectual biographies of men whose contributions to the Confucian movement have hardly begun to be studied. It is possible to suggest, however, that the thinking of men such as Chang Chiu-ch'eng, Lü Pen-cheng and Liu Tzu-hui, all influential in the Tao-hsueh movement, may well reflect the influence of Ta-hui's teaching.

Chapters III and IV will focus on Ta-hui's teaching that the "three teachings," Confucianism, Taoism and Buddhism, are one on the level of their most fundamental principles. This view was an important element

of scholar-official religion and culture from the Sung to the Ch'ing; further, this positive attitude toward truths other than one's own contributed greatly to the eclectic intellectual ferment out of which Neo-Confucian ideas were born, and had a great influence as well on Ch'an Buddhism. The view that "the Three Teachings return to one" also permitted Ta-hui and other Buddhist teachers to contribute to the movement in the Sung to rediscover the true and deep meanings of the Confucian classics.

Chapter V discusses the way in which Ta-hui addressed the emotional and spiritual needs of laymen in his sermons and offers evidence for our first thesis. It attempts to show the unique character of Ta-hui's concern for laymen, and the manner in which he urges laymen to seek the "monastic" goal of enlightenment in this lifetime. An argument is advanced that Ta-hui not only introduced unique content into his sermons to laymen, he also developed an existing but little-used sermon form into an instrument for addressing lay needs directly.

Chapters VI, VII and VIII offer evidence for our third thesis. Chapter VI investigates the possible scriptual sources of Ta-hui's effort to enable laymen to be enlightened through an examination of his understanding of and commitment to the Avataṃsaka-sūtra and its teaching of the interrelated oneness of all things. In the light of the teaching of the Avataṃsaka-sūtra such distinctions as monastic and lay, secular and sacred, this-worldly and transmundane could be seen as having no meaning from the point of view of enlightenment. It followed from this that enlightenment should be available to everyone, even laymen, and that

the highest form of practice could be carried out under all circumstances, even those of lay life.

Chapters VII and VIII continue this theme on a more practical level. In these chapters the distinctions Ta-hui draws between true and false and helpful and harmful forms of teaching and practice are explored, showing that it is precisely the form of Ch'an practice which is the most profound, the most effective, and the most theoretically defensible, namely hua-t'ou practice, that is the one form that can be practiced equally in times of quiet and in times of excitement or disturbance, at the monastery or in the Bureau of Military Affairs. In connection with this exploration of Ta-hui's teaching about hua-t'ou practice, his teachings about false or ineffective practice will be explored, and the theoretical underpinning of hua-t'ou, the theory of doubt, will be sketched. Ta-hui's insistence on the peculiar appropriateness of hua-t'ou practice to the mental diseases of scholar-officials will also be explored as evidence of the connection that Ta-hui drew between hua-t'ou practice and the needs of lay shih-tai-fu in particular.

For this study I have used the texts of Ta-hui's works which have been reprinted in the Taishō Tripitaka, the Zokuzōkyō and the Shukuzōkyō. With one exception I have not attempted to trace and examine extant Sung, Yüan and early Japanese copies of the texts used, in part because they were unavailable to me and in part because the excellent textual studies already done by Ishii Shūdō have shown to my satisfaction that the texts in the Taishō, the Zokuzōkyō and the Shukuzōkyō are based on quite early and reliable editions which do not differ markedly from the extant early copies. If I had been attempting a translation, or a full and detailed

biography, or were basing my conclusions on passages that occurred infrequently or in disputed texts, a more careful textual comparison might have been necessary. For the story I have to tell, the evidence I have presented is repeated over and over again in well authenticated works; the major themes of Ta-hui's teaching career are documented so voluminously and consistently throughout all of the records of his sayings and writings that it is impossible to imagine that any textual study would alter the general picture I have attempted to draw. I have placed a full account of what is known about the texts I have used in Appendix A.

As will be apparent to the reader, I have employed the traditional "methodologies" of the intellectual historian, only occasionally interjecting into the flow of narrative and analysis a few reflections on the meaning of Ta-hui's thought for the student of religion.

Chapter I: Ta-hui's Life

A. Early Years and Experience With Ch'an Teachers

Ta-hui was born in 1089 to a family named Hsi[1] 奚 in the Ning-kuo district of Hsüan-ch'eng 宣城寧國縣 .[2] Little is known about his early years: he related later that as a child of six or seven he loved to watch and listen whenever he heard a monk speaking; it is also said of him that at that age he was very serious and careful of what he said.[3] We are told that he entered the local school at the age of twelve, but that at thirteen he was forced to leave, for he had thrown an inkstone that had accidently hit the hat of the teacher. When his

---

1. Nien-p'u, p. 1a. The account in this chapter is largely dependent on Ta-hui's own recorded letters and sermons and on the Nien-p'u. The Nien-p'u was originally compiled by a disciple of Ta-hui named Tsu-yung 祖詠 sometime before 1183, and revised by Hua-tsang Tsung-yen 華藏宗演 in 1205 to accord with information given in a work called Yün-wo chi-t'an 雲臥紀談 by another of Ta-hui's Dharma-heirs, Hsiao-ying Chung-wen 曉瑩仲溫 . Other later biographies of Ta-hui in Chinese have been consulted, as have secondary accounts in Japanese. For a list of biographical sources consulted, see Appendix B. The author recognizes the bias which any biographical account that depends largely upon the Nien-p'u risks, since its compiler and reviser were seeking to establish the subject's claim to greatness and may have omitted unfavorable facts and episodes known to them. The reader is urged, therefore, to bear in mind the nature of the sources on which this chapter is based. On the whole, other biographical accounts are in close agreement with the Nien-p'u. Further, the Nien-p'u itself appears to be very faithful to those of its sources that the author has been able to identify and examine. For further bibliographical information about the Nien-p'u, see Yanagida Seizan, "Zenseki kaidai," in Yanagida Seizan and Nishitani Keiji, eds., Zenke goroku, II (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1974), p. 488, and Ishii Shūdō, "Daie goroku no kisoteki kenkyū (ge)," Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyō Gakubu kenkyū kiyō, XXXII, No. 3 (March, 1975), pp. 151-71.

2. Nien-p'u, p. 1a.

3. Nien-p'u, p. 1b.

father subsequently scolded him, Ta-hui told his father that he had no interest in studying mundane learning, but rather wanted to study the Dharma that leads beyond the world. His father replied that he had hoped that his son would become a monk. Ta-hui wanted to leave for a temple at once, but his mother would not hear of it.[1] At sixteen, however, he realized this ambition, taking his first vows under a teacher named Hui-ch'i 慧齊. Hui-ch'i gave him his Dharma name, Tsung-kao.[2]

In 1105, at the age of seventeen, Ta-hui received full ordination as a monk.[3] In this year Ta-hui became interested in the teachings of the Ch'an school, reading the *Recorded Sayings* of various Ch'an teachers. He reported later that he particularly liked the *Recorded Sayings of Yün-men* (*Yün-men yü-lu* 雲門語錄), by the Ch'an master Yün-men Wen-yen 雲門文偃 (864-949).[4] Later that same year he had a religious experience while reading a sūtra.[5]

In the following year Ta-hui began formally studying Ch'an.[6] This was the beginning of an eighteen-year period during which Ta-hui studied

---

1. *Nien-p'u*, p. 1b.

2. *Nien-p'u*, p. 1b. The teacher is known as Tung-shan Hui-yun Yüan Hui-ch'i 東山慧雲院慧齊.

3. The ordination took place at Ching-te Ssu (*Nien-p'u*, p. 2a).

4. *Nien-p'u*, p. 2a. This work is an attempt at a critical synthesis of all of the T'ang and Five Dynasties Ch'an schools. Cf. Yanagida Seizan "Chūgoku Zenshū shi," in *Zen no rekishi - Chūgoku* (*Kōza Zen*, III), ed. by Nishitani Keiji (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1967), p. 85.

5. *Nien-p'u*, p. 2a.

6. *Nien-p'u*, p. 2a. Among his first teachers were Feng-sheng Ch'u 奉聖初 and Kuang-chiao Shao-ch'eng 廣教紹珵. Cf. Ogisu Jundo, "Daie Zenji no *Hekiganshu* shoki ni tsuite," *JIBS*, XI, No. 1 (Jan., 1963), p. 116. (Hereafter cited as "Ogisu, 'Shoki'.")

under many teachers before reaching an enduring enlightenment under Yüan-wu K'o-ch'in 圓悟克勤. In 1107 Ta-hui went to T'ai-p'ing-chou 太平州, Lu-shan 廬山 in Kiangsi Province, and Ying-chou 郢州 in Hupei; in that year he studied under at least three teachers.[1] The following year he began to study the teachings of the Ts'ao-tung school of Ch'an in Ying-chou under the Ch'an teacher Tung-shan Wei 洞山微 and two other teachers.[2] Ta-hui later said that Tung-shan Wei did teach a moment of awakening (wu 悟, Jap. satori) as a feature of the path, but that this teaching differed from his own later teaching. Wei further taught a number of the ideas and categories that characterized the Ts'ao-Tung school, such as the theory of the Five Ranks or Five Stages. Ta-hui reported later that he had mastered them all, but was still unsatisfied, and felt a nagging doubt: since all of the great Ch'an figures of the T'ang dynasty had emphasized a moment of awakening, it must, he felt, be an important thing.[3]

In 1109 Ta-hui went to Shu-chou 舒州 to study under Hai-hui Ts'ung 海會從.[4] At the end of the year, Ta-hui left there to accept a position as hua-chu 化主 in Hsüan-chou, his native region.[5] He was then twenty-one years of age.

---

1. Nien-p'u, p. 2a.

2. Nien-p'u, p. 2a.

3. Nien-p'u, p. 2a.

4. Nien-p'u, p. 2b.

5. Nien-p'u, p. 2b. Hua-chu was the title of an officer in the monastery, one who appealed to laymen for donations. Cf. Jimbo Nyoten and Andō Bunei, eds., Zengaku jiten (Tokyo: Muga Sanbo, 1927), p. 308.

Three years later at the age of twenty-four Ta-hui returned to the study of Ch'an under the famous teacher Chan-t'ang Wen-chün 湛堂文準.[1] In Chan-t'ang, Ta-hui finally found a teacher under whom he could make considerable progress, and he stayed with Chan-t'ang at Pao Peak in Hunan Province until the latter's death in 1115. During Chan-t'ang's last illness Ta-hui asked his teacher whom he should study under should Chan-t'ang die. Chan-t'ang replied, "There is a teacher named K'o-ch'in (Yüan-wu). I don't know him [personally] but I feel sure that if you study under him you will reach enlightenment."[2]

Ta-hui remembered this advice, but he did not follow it immediately. Under Chan-t'ang, Ta-hui had been the senior monk, and on the death of his teacher he took responsibility for editing Chan-t'ang's Recorded Sayings. He also arranged for a famous Dharma-brother of Chan-t'ang, Tou-shuai Ch'iu-chao 兜率求照, to assist him and write a preface to the work.[3] In 1116 he sought out the great former prime minister and lay Buddhist scholar Chang Shang-ying 張商英 to ask him to write a memorial tablet inscription for Chan-t'ang. Chang Shang-ying was at Ching-nan 荊南 in the central part of Hupei when Ta-hui visited him. Ta-hui impressed and delighted the older man, who agreed to write an

---

1. Nien-p'u, p. 2b. Chan-t'ang Wen-chün was the Dharma-heir of Chen-ching K'o-wen 真淨克文 (1025-1102); see Chapter V below.

2. Nien-p'u, p. 3a. In a sermon recorded in his P'u Shuo, Ta-hui gives a slightly different version of this story. He says: "[Chan-t'ang] said: There are several disciples of Wu-tsu, I am acquainted with them all. You should go to see Ch'üan-ch'in [Yüan-wu]; only then will you be able to complete [your study of Ch'an]" (P'u Shuo, p. 456a).

3. Nien-p'u, p. 3a-b.

inscription for Chan-t'ang. Chang Shang-ying gave Ta-hui the name of Miao-hsi 妙喜, a name which he later used frequently in speaking of himself.[1]

On this visit to Chang Shang-ying, Ta-hui became acquainted with the poet Li Shang-lao 李商老;[2] they soon became great friends. Two years later Ta-hui wrote a piece in honor of Hai-hui Tsung, his former teacher. Li Shang-lao copied it by hand and praised it highly.[3]

For the next several years Ta-hui remained in the circle of Chan-t'ang's Dharma brothers Tou-shuai Ch'iu-chao and Chüeh-fan Hui-hung 覺範慧洪.[4] During this period he met a man who was to prove a lifelong friend, Han Tzu-ts'ang 韓子蒼,[5] who at the time was studying under Chüeh-fan Hui-hung.

In 1119 Ta-hui decided to pay another visit to Chang Shang-ying. Chang gave him a place to live at his official residence; Ta-hui remained there eight months. The two men had long discussions about the relation between Buddhism and Confucianism and about Hsüeh-tou's famous collection of poetic comments on <u>kung-an</u> 公案 of earlier teachers. Chang Shang-ying advised Ta-hui to seek out Yüan-wu to be his teacher, and offered Ta-hui financial assistance to enable him to make

---

1. <u>Nien-p'u</u>, p. 3a-b. Chang Shang-ying was also known as Wu-chin Chü-shih 無盡居士. For more about Chang Shang-ying's connection with Buddhism, see Chapter VI.

2. <u>Nien-p'u</u>, p. 3a-b. Biographical information for Li P'eng 李彭 (T. Shang-lao 商老) is available in <u>SYHAPI</u>, <u>chüan</u> 19, p. 69b.

3. <u>Nien-p'u</u>, p. 4a.

4. <u>Nien-p'u</u>, pp. 3b-4a.

5. <u>Nien-p'u</u>, p. 4a.

the trip to the capital to find Yüan-wu. Ta-hui left Chang's home in the tenth month of that year (1120); Chang died very shortly thereafter.[1]

The following months Ta-hui spent traveling, finally reaching the capital at Pien-liang 汴梁 (modern Kaifeng) in 1122.[2] Yüan-wu, however, was not there. Rather than follow after Yüan-wu, Ta-hui decided to wait in the capital for his return. In the meantime he studied with another Ch'an teacher, P'u-jung P'ing 普融平, and found a patron who built him a residence of his own.[3]

B. Enlightenment and National Prominence

In 1124 Ta-hui learned that Yüan-wu had been commanded to return to the capital to take up residence at T'ien-ning Ssu 天寧寺. It seemed that Ta-hui finally would have the opportunity to follow the recommendation of his teacher Chan-t'ang and his friend Chang Shang-ying, and sit at the feet of Yüan-wu. But Ta-hui was apprehensive: what if Yüan-wu's teaching were no more helpful than that of Ta-hui's previous teachers? At thirty-six Ta-hui was almost ready to conclude that true Ch'an had disappeared, or that perhaps it had never existed.[4] The Ch'an Ta-hui had experienced did not match the promise of earlier teachers.

However, Ta-hui was not to be disappointed in Yüan-wu, nor in the promise of enlightenment in Ch'an. On the first day of the fourth month

---

1. Nien-p'u, p. 4a-b.

2. Nien-p'u, pp. 4b-5a.

3. Nien-p'u, p. 5a.

4. Nien-p'u, p. 5a.

in 1125 Ta-hui entered the assembly of monks studying under Yüan-wu. On the thirteenth day of the fifth month, a mere forty-odd days later, Ta-hui experienced a decisive moment of awakening.[1] The occasion was a sermon sponsored by the wife of a prominent official. In the sermon Yüan-wu posed the following exchange (wen-ta 問答, Jap. mondo):

> A monk asked Yün-men, "What is the place like where all the Buddhas are born?" Yun-men answered: The East Mountain travels on the water (Tung-shan shui-shang hsing 東山水上行).

Yüan-wu continued:

> If today someone were to ask me what the place is like where all the Buddhas are ~~born,~~ I would reply: "The hsün 薰 wind (southeast wind) comes from the south, and the palace has a slight coolness."[2]

On hearing these words, Ta-hui experienced a marvelous end to all his doubts, and a feeling of great peace, joy and release. When he went to report his breakthrough to Yüan-wu, the teacher made Ta-hui an attendant without duties in the quarters where court guests were entertained, a spot where Yüan-wu could supervise his progress personally every day. Seeing that his enlightenment needed further refinement, Yüan-wu gave Ta-hui another hua-t'ou 話頭 to work on. Every day for half a year Ta-hui worked on this hua-t'ou under Yüan-wu's supervision. Finally one day Ta-hui asked Yüan-wu to tell him how his teacher Wu-tsu Fa-yen 五祖法演 had replied to Yüan-wu's asking about that same hua-t'ou once in the past. When Yüan-wu complied, Ta-hui experienced

---

1. Nien-p'u, p. 5a.

2. Nien-p'u, p. 5a-b.

a complete and certain enlightenment. Yüan-wu tested it by posing other hua-t'ou to Ta-hui and found that Ta-hui could answer them all without the slightest hesitation. Yüan-wu then gave Ta-hui a residence of his own at T'ien-ning Ssu and allowed Ta-hui to share in the teaching and preaching duties as a fellow teacher.[1]

In the following year events of national significance intruded on the placid life of the monastery. In the eighth month of 1126 Ta-hui and Yüan-wu joined the stream of refugees leaving the capital for the south to escape from the advancing Chin 金.[2] Ta-hui and Yüan-wu found refuge at Yang-chou 楊州,[3] but in the following year crossed the Yangtze river and moved further south to Chin-shan 金山.[4] Leaving Yüan-wu at Chin-shan, Ta-hui proceeded to Hu-ch'iu 虎丘 where he took up residence for nearly a year. During his stay at Hu-ch'iu he read the Hua-yen ching 華嚴經 (Avataṃsaka sūtra), and experienced yet another breakthrough into a deeper level of wisdom.[5]

Yüan-wu meanwhile had moved to Yün-chü-shan 雲居山; in the tenth month of 1128 Ta-hui traveled to Yün-chü-shan to join Yüan-wu, where he took up residence in the senior monk's quarters.[6] In 1129 the

---

1. Nien-p'u, pp. 5a-6a.

2. Nien-p'u, pp. 5b-6a.

3. Nien-p'u, p. 6a. Yang-chou was the Sung capital in exile for a while, but was burnt by the Chin in 1128.

4. Nien-p'u, p. 6a.

5. Nien-p'u, p. 6a-b.

6. Nien-p'u, p. 6b.

paths of Ta-hui and Yüan-wu were to part once more. Yüan-wu set out for Szechwan,[1] and Ta-hui decided to build a small hut on the site of Yün-men's old residence not far from Yün-chu-shan in Kiangsi, and to go into retirement from the heavy teaching and preaching duties he had shared with Yüan-wu. Yüan-wu applauded this decision, reminding Ta-hui of the numerous early Ch'an teachers who had spent many years in retirement, teaching very few students, and who had nonetheless made a great impact upon the world.[2] For the next six years Ta-hui enjoyed a quiet life in comparative retirement, first at Hai-hun 海昏 near Yung-hsiu 永修 in Kiangsi with only twenty monks in attendance,[3] then in Hunan.[4] He then returned to Hai-hun, where he spent most of the period from 1131 to 1133 teaching a small number of students and co-authoring with a fellow monk from the monastic community poetic commentaries on old and famous *hua-t'ou*.[5]

In 1133 the governor of Lin-ch'uan 臨川 in Kiangsi invited Ta-hui to preach at a feast for monks that he planned to give in order to make merit on his birthday. When Ta-hui refused, pleading that he was not yet ready to come out of retirement, the governor prevailed upon two of Ta-hui's friends, Han Tzu-ts'ang and Lü Pen-chung 呂本中, to write

---

1. *Nien-p'u*, pp. 6b-7a.

2. *Nien-p'u*, pp. 6b-7a.

3. *Nien-p'u*, p. 7a.

4. *Nien-p'u*, p. 7a.

5. *Nien-p'u*, p. 7a-b. Ta-hui with Tung-lin Kuei Ch'an-shih 東林珪禪師 wrote verses on 110 *kung-an*. This became the *Tung-lin chu sung ku* 東林主頌古 (*Zokuzōkyō*, 2, 23).

urging him to come. Han's letter to Ta-hui is a stirring entreaty to abandon the life of a hermit-monk. Han argued that the Ch'an Way was in a state of decline in the world, and that he knew that Yüan-wu had hoped Ta-hui would spread his knowledge and influence widely. If Ta-hui continued to "sit alone on his peak, wearing grass and eating roots," he would never accomplish what Yüan-wu had anticipated. Ta-hui's present course, said Han, was that of a man who cared only about his own enlightenment: surely it could not be what Yüan-wu wished for Ta-hui![1]

This entreaty must have moved Ta-hui, for although he did not go to the governor's feast, he did go to Lin-ch'uan to call on Han Tzu-ts'ang and Lü Pen-chung. Ta-hui stayed in Han's house for half a year.[2]

In 1134 Ta-hui spent a good part of the year travelling to Fuchou in Fukien Province.[3] Here he began to attack Ch'an teachings and teachers that he considered heretical; he also wrote a treatise called "Discriminating the Heretical and the Correct" (Pien cheng-hsieh shuo 辯正邪說) to clarify the distinction between true and false teachings.[4] The principal error that Ta-hui attacked was the rejection

---

1. Nien-p'u, p. 7b.

2. Nien-p'u, p. 7b.

3. Nien-p'u, pp. 7b-8a.

4. Nien-p'u, p. 7b. Chu Hsi in Chu-tzu yü-lei, chuan 126, refers to a work by Ta-hui called Cheng-hsieh lun. Presumably this is the same work to which the Nien-p'u refers as Pien cheng-hsieh shuo (Cf. Ishii Shūdō, "Daie Sōkō to sono deshi-tachi (roku)," JIBS, XXIII, No. 1 [Dec., 1974], pp. 336-39). There are repeated indications in the Nien-p'u, the P'u Shuo, and the Yü-lu (for example, P'u Shuo, p. 443a; P'u Shuo, p. 442b; P'u Shuo, p. 428b; Yü-lu, Taishō 47, pp. 884c-85a) that it was the satori-denying "silent illumination" Ch'an that he encountered in Fukien that first aroused his public condemnation. In the article cited above Ishii

of practice toward a moment of awakening (wu) in favor of "silent illumination" practice. His first target was a teacher who also claimed to be a Dharma-heir of Yüan-wu and thus a member of Ta-hui's own line.[1] Ta-hui thus began to earn his nickname "Kao who bawls out Heaven."[2]

In early 1135 Ta-hui accepted an invitation to move to Ch'üan-chou 泉州 in Fukien; an official provided him a residence there.[3] The following year, while still in Ch'üan-chou, Ta-hui learned of the death of his teacher Yüan-wu the previous year.[4]

---

suggests, citing P'u Shuo, p. 443b-c and Nien-p'u, pp. 7b-8a as evidence, that Ta-hui's positive insistence on the necessity and efficacy of hua-t'ou practice began in Fukien at the same time. See footnote 2 on p. 262 below.

1. Nien-p'u, pp. 7b-8a. The teacher he attacked and challenged was Hsiang-yün T'an-i 祥雲曇懿.

2. Ogisu, "Shoki," p. 117; the nickname in Chinese was Kao ma T'ien 杲罵天.

3. Nien-p'u, p. 8a-b. Ch'üan-chou was a populous city (Kracke reports that it had 201,406 households around 1075 [Civil Service, p. 13]) and a major center of coastal trade. "In 1087 a Superintendency of Foreign Trade (shih-po ssu) was set up in Ch'üan-chou, and by Southern Sung times this port had become, both in name and reality, the lynch-pin of trade with Southeast Asia" (Shiba Yoshinobu, Commerce and Society in Sung China, Michigan Abstracts of Chinese and Japanese Works on Chinese History, No. 2, trans. by Mark Elvin [Ann Arbor, Michigan: Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan, 1970], p. 181). Fukien as a whole was very prosperous at the time when Ta-hui moved there; it was a leading area for both Confucian scholarship (Fukien was producing more holders of the chin-shih degree than any other province) and for Buddhism, which was very popular in the province (Shiba, pp. 181-86). Ch'üan-chou had been a major center of Ch'an teaching during the Five Dynasties period, but had lost ground to Chekiang and to Fu-chou in the Sung. On Ch'an Buddhism in Ch'üan-chou prior to Ta-hui's time, see Suzuki Tetsuo, "Senshū ni okeru Zenshū," JIBS, XXIV, No. 1 (Dec., 1975), pp. 109-13. On Buddhism in Fu-chou in the Sung, see Sogabe Shizuo, "Sōdai Fukushū no Bukkyō," in Tsukamoto Hakase shōju kinen Bukkyōshigaku ronshū, (Kyoto, 1961), pp. 443-55. Ta-hui's move to Ch'üan-chou may have been a first step into the mainstream of Ch'an monastic leadership.

4. Nien-p'u, p. 8b.

In 1137 Ta-hui emerged on the national scene as a prominent cleric and teacher. In that year he was invited by the court through the agency of Chang Chün 張浚, who at the time was one of the two most important ministers in the empire, to become the abbot of the Neng-jen Ssu 能仁寺 on Ching-shan 徑山 in Lin-an-fu 臨安府.[1] Ta-hui arrived in the capital and took up his duties as abbot in the seventh month.[2] Within a year he had attracted a thousand monks to his monastery to study Ch'an.[3]

It was not only geographical location which signalled Ta-hui's entrance onto the national stage. Neng-jen Ssu was a monastery which at that time was directly under government control. The Sung had inaugurated a system of temples, the famous "Five Mountains and Ten Monasteries," which were especially designated as places for prayer for the sake of the dynasty. The abbots of these temples could not be chosen without the approval of the court. Ching-shan was the most eminent of the Five Mountains;[4] thus that Ta-hui's invitation should be initiated by a leading minister, Chang Chün, was fully in order. Naturally the dynasty

1. Nien-p'u, p. 9a-b.

2. Nien-p'u, p. 9a.

3. Nien-p'u, p. 9b.

4. The system is described briefly by Yanagida ("Chūgoku Zenshū shi," pp. 95-97), and by Imaeda Aishin (Chūsei Zenshi no kenkyū [Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1970], pp. 141-46). Ching-shan is ranked first on all of the extant lists of the "Five Mountains"; in the Nien-p'u a contemporary is quoted as commemorating Ta-hui's selection to occupy "the premier abbotship of the nation" (Nien-p'u, p. 9a).

chose for this relationship monasteries close to the capital that had a distinguished history, great wealth, or considerable potential influence. To be chosen to head such a monastery was a great honor and privilege; to accept was a decision to emerge from retirement, to cease to avoid politics and the world of the court.

C. Exile and Return

Between 1137 and 1143 Ta-hui's work upon Ching-shan, apparently unaffected by controversy and factional struggle at the capital, showed great promise. His teaching made a great stir: his students numbered over 2000, and he was heralded as having revived the glory of Lin-chi's line of Ch'an teaching,[1] the line to which he belonged as Yüan-wu's Dharma-heir. His attacks on heretical teachings continued. In 1141 an additional dormitory for 1000 monks was completed for his students. The dedication inscription was written by Li Ping 李邴, a prominent official. It contained the following description of Ta-hui's impact:

> The teacher is a descendent in the 20th generation of Lin-chi. Because his Way is great, his followers are numerous. His path is very steep, and climbing is very difficult. His instructions are clear, and those who are enlightened are very close to him. His ideas are high, so that those who hear are astounded.[2]

But in 1143, in the midst of what was apparently a very successful teaching and preaching period at Ching-shan, Ta-hui was banished to

---

1. Nien-p'u, p. 9b.

2. Nien-p'u, p. 10a.

Heng-chou 衡州 in Hunan.[1] The reason given was that he had criticized governmental policy in a conversation with an official, Chang Chiu-ch'eng 張九成.[2]

Ta-hui spent the following sixteen years in exile, first in Heng-chou in Hunan until 1150 and then in Mei-chou 梅州 in Kwangtung Province until 1156.[3] During the Sung, exiles were sent to military colonies in the border regions. Hunan was a region which experienced serious problems with bandits during the early Southern Sung,[4] and which, during the whole Sung period, had had an extraordinary number of uprisings by non-Han tribes, notably the Yao and Miao.[5] For these reasons it counted as a border region in two senses, both as a region of uncertain Sung control and as a region of difficult relations between Han immigrants and non-Chinese indigenous peoples. We do not know a great deal about the conditions of Ta-hui's life in Heng-chou, but it appears that his years there were comparatively pleasant. Friends sent him money, and although he was no longer allowed to be a monk, he continued some preaching and teaching activities. He also frequently wrote letters to his scholar-official friends.[6] During his stay in Heng-chou he compiled his famous

---

1. Also called Heng-yang 衡陽. Nien-p'u, p. 10a-b.

2. Nien-p'u, p. 10a-b.

3. Or Mei-yang 梅陽. Nien-p'u, p. 13a.

4. Edward Harold Kaplan, "Yüeh Fei and the Founding of the Southern Sung" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1970), pp. 163-75.

5. Li Chi, Formation of the Chinese People (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1928) lists 112 tribal uprisings in Hunan between 960 and 1279, as compared with 23 in Kwangtung in the same period (p. 250).

6. Nien-p'u, pp. 10a-13a.

kung-an collection, called Treasury of the True Dharma Eye (Cheng fa-yen tsang 正法眼藏),[1] a title later also used by his famous detractor, the great Japanese Zen monk Dōgen. It was also at this time that he is thought to have burned the wood printing blocks for the famous Blue Cliff Records (Pi-yen lu 碧巖錄) compiled by his teacher Yüan-wu.[2]

---

1. Nien-p'u, p. 11b.

2. Ogisu, "Shoki," pp. 115-18. The story of Ta-hui's burning of the wood printing blocks for the Blue Cliff Records (Pi-yen lu) is one of the most striking and durable of Ch'an traditions. D. T. Suzuki, for example, tells the story in his An Introduction to Zen Buddhism:

> "This is where lurks the danger of the kōan system. One is apt to consider it as everything in the study of Zen, forgetting the true object of Zen which is the unfolding of man's inner life. There are many who have fallen into this pitfall and the inevitable result has been the corruption and decay of Zen. Daiye (Ta-hui) was quite apprehensive of this when he burned up the book on [sic] one hundred kōans which was compiled by his master Yengo (Yüan-wu). These one hundred kōans were selected from Zen literature by Seccho (Hsüeh-tou), who commented on them with verses, one to each. Daiye was a true follower of Zen. He knew well the object which his master had in view when he gave remarks on these selections; he knew very well that they would subsequently prove a self-murdering weapon against Zen; so he committed them all into flame" (Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, An Introduction to Zen Buddhism [Kyoto: The Eastern Buddhist Society, 1934], pp. 128-29).

Did this dramatic act ever take place? The evidence for the historicity of this legend is found in several sources. In the Yüan dynasty reprint of the Pi-yen lu is an afterword written by Hsü-ku Hsi-ling 虛谷希陵 in which he says:

> "Later Ta-hui Ch'an-shih found that when students came into his room [to present their realization], their replies [to his questions] were slightly off. When he doubted [their realization] and

In 1150 Ta-hui was ordered to shift his place of exile to the far less comfortable Mei-chou. He took the occasion of the journey to visit the home of the sixth Chinese Ch'an patriarch, Hui-neng 慧能, on the way.[1]

Kwangtung was a region that had only recently become sinicized. In the T'ang a system of military farm colonies had been instituted in the region, and a stream of exiled officials of the T'ang and Sung

---

> questioned them further just a bit, their false 'sharpness' crumbled. When he cross-examined further, they capitulated, and confessed, 'I memorized [that answer] from the Blue Cliff Collection. I really haven't experienced enlightenment.' Because he feared that later students would not see clearly the fundamental truth, but pay attention only to words in order to gain verbal victories, [Ta-hui] burned [the Blue Cliff Records] in order to save [students from] this grave mistake. The intention which originally compiled this book and that which burned it were one. How could they be different?" (Pi-yen lu Hsi-lin hou-hsü, Taishō 48, p. 224c).

Another more contemporary source is a letter reportedly from Hsin-men T'an-pi 心聞曇賁 to Chang Chiu-ch'eng, which states that after Ta-hui went to Fukien Province and saw that students were being harmed by their attraction to the Pi-yen chi, he destroyed the woodblocks. Burning is not mentioned. This letter is in Ch'an-lin pao-hsün 禪林寶訓, chuan 4, Taishō 48, p. 1036b-c. The Ch'an-lin pao-hsün is said to have been begun by Ta-hui and Chu-an Shih-kuei 竹庵士珪, and finished by Ching-shan between 1174 and 1189 (Yanagida, "Zenseki kaidai," p. 489). It is puzzling that Ta-hui's burning of the woodblocks is not mentioned in his Nien-p'u or in any of his letters and sermons. On the other hand, the book did go out of circulation, and was not printed again apparently until 1302. Modern scholars such as Ogisu Jundō and Yanagida Seizan seem provisionally to accept the authenticity of the tradition. Cf. Ogisu, "Shoki"; Yanagida, "Chūgoku Zenshū shi," pp. 98-99; and Yanagida, "Zenseki kaidai," p. 486.

1. Nien-p'u, p. 12a. On the 14th day of the 7th month Ta-hui arrived in Ts'ao-hsi 曹谿 where he ritually honored Hui-neng.

dynasties had begun to transform the indigenous culture.[1] Even so, in 1080, 71.5% of the households in Kwangtung were indigenous non-Han peoples.[2] Parts of Kwangtung were still quite undeveloped, and the total population had risen only very slowly despite the recent influx of northerners. One reason for this situation is thought to have been the malarial condition prevalent throughout the region.[3]

Mei-chou was in northeastern Kwangtung near Ch'ao-chou 潮州. The region was mountainous and malarial: the T'ang dynasty writer Han Yü wrote of the Ch'ao-chou region as a "sea of pestilence rising to the heavens; the poisoned vapors issue night and day; typhoons and crocodiles abound, and calamities cannot be measured."[4] In the Sung, officials from the districts around Ch'ao-chou annually left in the summer months from June to October for Chao-ch'ing city to avoid the malarial conditions.[5] Ta-hui spoke of Mei-chou as a malaria-ridden area where even medicines were not readily available and from which few exiles returned, and praised the students who followed him there to study as willing to risk death in order to study the Way.[6]

---

1. Harold J. Wiens, Han Chinese Expansion in South China (Hamden, Conn: The Shoestring Press, Inc., 1967; originally published in 1954 under the title: Chinese March Toward the Tropics), pp. 142-43.

2. Wiens, p. 182.

3. Wiens, pp. 143-44.

4. Quoted in Wiens, p. 335.

5. Wiens, p. 335.

6. Nien-p'u, p. 13a. Banishment to pestilentialKwangtung was tantamount to a sentence of death. Ta-hui states that 62 students followed him to that dangerous climate to study with him.

In 1156 Ta-hui was at last released from exile, and in the first month of the year left Mei-chou for the north.[1] He spent the year traveling, visiting Chang Chiu-ch'eng at Yung-chia 永嘉 (Wen-chou 溫州) in Fukien, and Chang Chün at Ch'ang-sha 長沙 in Hunan, then revisiting his old haunts in Ching-chou in Hupei and his native Hsüan-ch'eng in Anhwei, among other places.[2]

On the recommendation of the famous Ts'ao-tung teacher Hung-chih 宏智 who was teaching at the time in Ming-chou 明州 at T'ien-t'ung-shan 天童山 , Ta-hui received an imperial invitation to become the 19th abbot of a temple on Ah-yü-wang-shan 阿育王山 in Chekiang, one of the official "Five Mountains."[3] By the end of 1156 he had taken up his duties there; in early 1157 he visited Hung-chih at T'ien-t'ung-shan, the first and only known meeting between these two famous advocates of opposing methods of Ch'an practice.[4]

Ta-hui stayed at Ah-yü-wang-shan for another year, teaching 1200 resident monks and receiving many eminent lay visitors. Although Ah-yü-wang-shan was one of the great centers of Buddhist learning in Chekiang, Ta-hui found the housing for monks inadequate to accommodate his large following. Even more troublesome was the fact that the monastery was located at a considerable altitude where the water supply was insufficient.

---

1. Nien-p'u, p. 13a.

2. Nien-p'u, p. 13a-b.

3. Nien-p'u, p. 13b. Ishii, "Daie Sōkō to sono deshi-tachi (roku)", p. 339. Yanagida, "Chūgoku Zenshū shi," p. 265.

4. Nien-p'u, p. 13b. See Chapter VI below.

With the help of lay donors Ta-hui had dormitories built and a pond dug to store water. The Chief Minister T'ang Ssu-t'ui 湯思退 contributed to these efforts.[1] In early 1158 Ta-hui attended Hung-chih's funeral.[2]

In 1158 Ta-hui was invited to return to Ching-shan,[3] the monastery in Lin-an-fu where Ta-hui first brought his teaching to the capital and from which he had been exiled in 1141. In the summer of 1158 there were 1000 monks studying there under Ta-hui.[4] His return to prominence had begun at Ah-yü-wang-shan; with his return at the age of 69 to Ching-shan, the highest ranking of the official "Five Mountains," his place of eminence in the contemporary Buddhist world was secured.

For the next four years Ta-hui traveled extensively while maintaining his position and activities at Ching-shan.[5] T'ang Ssu-t'ui continued his active patronage, and the future Emperor Hsiao Tsung showed a considerable interest in Ta-hui.[6] In 1161 Ta-hui resigned his position

---

1. Nien-p'u, pp. 13b-14a. While Ta-hui was at Ah-yü-wang-shan the future Emperor Hsiao Tsung, who was P'u An Chung Wang 普安忠王 at the time, came to visit Ta-hui there. Ta-hui presented a gatha to him.

2. Nien-p'u, p. 14a.

3. Nien-p'u, p. 14a.

4. Nien-p'u, p. 14a.

5. Nien-p'u, pp. 14a-15a.

6. Nien-p'u, p. 14b.

as abbot of Ching-shan and retired to a residence on the mountain built for him by a lay donor and called Ming-yüeh-t'ang 明月堂.[1] In the same year Ta-hui preached the Dharma at the invitation of lay students in Shang-chou 商州 in Kiangsu to raise a large sum of money for the completion of a temple to honor Confucius.[2]

In 1162 Hsiao Tsung ascended the throne, and immediately invited Ta-hui to come to the palace to teach him about the Dharma. Hsiao Tsung gave Ta-hui the name "Ta-hui" on this occasion.[3]

In the third month of 1163, Ta-hui, although ill, read the Hua-yen sūtra before a large crowd to make merit for the protection of the state and the welfare of the people (pao-kuo k'ang-min 保國康民).[4] He also traveled to various places. In the seventh month he returned to Ching-shan.[5] Knowing that his death was near, he acceded to the request of his monastic followers to give them parting advice.[6] On the ninth day of the eighth month he announced his death on the morrow, and sent a farewell letter to the emperor.[7] He also sent farewell messages to

1. Nien-p'u, p. 15a. Retirement required imperial permission.
2. Nien-p'u, p. 15a.
3. Nien-p'u, p. 15a.
4. Nien-p'u, p. 15b.
5. Nien-p'u, p. 15b.
6. Nien-p'u, p. 15b.
7. Nien-p'u, p. 15b.

T'ang Ssu-t'ui and other friends.[1] His death on the tenth resembled closely the death he had described to his followers as that of an enlightened man. He was calm and clear in mind, and at the request of his disciple wrote out a gāthā with his own hand. It read:

> Life is just this,
> Death is just this,
> To have a gāthā or not,
> Why should it matter?[2]

On finishing it he put down his brush and took to his bed.[3] On the twentieth day of the month he was buried behind the Ming-yüeh-t'ang.[4] The Emperor ordered the Ming-yüeh-t'ang renamed Miao-hsi-an 妙喜庵 after Ta-hui, and gave Ta-hui the posthumous name of P'u-chüeh 普覺.[5] Universally acknowledged as the most eminent monk of his time, Ta-hui left more than one hundred and ten monastic Dharma-heirs, as well as scores of lay disciples who had been deeply affected by his teaching.[6] Yet in all he had taught no more than ten years in large public monasteries, and had spent sixteen of his potentially most productive years, from age fifty-three to age sixty-nine, in remote corners of the empire with little opportunity to reach many students.

---

1. Nien-p'u, p. 15b.

2. Nien-p'u, p. 15b.

3. Nien-p'u, p. 15b.

4. Nien-p'u, p. 15b. A pagoda was built on the site, and named Pao-kuang 寶光 by the Emperor.

5. Nien-p'u, 15b-16a.

6. Nien-p'u, p. 15b gives a list of his monastic Dharma-heirs and lay followers.

D. Politics in the Early Southern Sung

In the years between 1137 and 1143, Ta-hui had contact with many men who were important at court at that time. Most of these men found themselves during these years in the midst of a national policy struggle of the first importance, the outcome of which was to settle the fortunes of the dynasty for a hundred years. This was of course the debate about whether to make peace with the Chin 金, the barbarian military power to the north which in 1126-27 had successfully driven the Sung from the northern heartland of China. To understand the banishment of Ta-hui and the fate of his friends, it is necessary to review briefly the history of this controversy.

Full-scale war with the Chin had begun in 1125.[1] Ta-hui fled from Kaifeng to Yang-chou in the eighth month of 1126, shortly before the Chin captured Kaifeng and the last two emperors of the Northern Sung, Hui Tsung 徽宗 and his son Ch'in Tsung 欽宗.[2] Ch'in Tsung's brother, known as Kao Tsung 高宗, who had been sent to the south to find a new temporary capital, assumed the emperorship in the absence of his captive brother.[3] The remaining Sung armies withdrew in a rout across the Yangtze river, which became the new de facto border between the land still held by the Sung and the land held by the Chin and its puppet states. Two

---

1. Kaplan, p. 38. The account of political events given in this chapter is drawn largely from Kaplan.

2. Hui Tsung abdicated in the 12th month of 1125. For the capture of the former emperor and the emperor, cf. Kaplan, p. 39.

3. Kaplan, pp. 58-59. The K'ang Wang 康王 formally ascended the throne in the 5th month of 1127.

outstanding political leaders emerged from among Kao Tsung's retinue, Chang Chün 張浚 and Chao Ting 趙鼎, as well as one outstanding general, Yüeh Fei 岳飛.[1]

Between 1127 and 1131 the fortunes of the Southern Sung dynasty were very precarious: at one point the Chin drove far enough across the Yangtze into Southern Sung territory that the Emperor was forced to take to the sea to avoid capture; at another point a rebellion by a court faction briefly held the Emperor captive and deposed him.[2]

The region into which the Sung came was infested with bandits leading large private armies: in 1130, for example, there was a bandit army in Hsüan-chou, Ta-hui's home town. Such bandits were particularly dangerous because they might defect to the Chin side. Even the Sung armies were loyal primarily to their generals; defections by whole armies were not unknown.

Despite the weakness of the newly established Southern Sung, many urged preparation for an aggressive war to regain territory. Filial piety dictated that Kao Tsung make every effort to rescue his father, mother and brother. The fact that they were of royal blood made rescue the duty of every subject. Other less personal considerations also weighed on the side of continuing the war in the hope of a successful offensive. The north was the historic center of Chinese dynasties; only in recent centuries had the south come to play an important economic

---

1. Chang Chün's biography appears in SS, chüan 361. Chao Ting's biography appears in SS, chüan 360.

2. The Emperor went as far south by boat as Wen-chou in Fukien. Cf. Kaplan, pp. 95-101.

role, and the history of Chinese culture in the south was very short. How could Changan, Loyang, the beloved Kaifeng, and the homelands of Confucius and Mencius be left in the hands of the barbarians? To agree to a peace with the Chin which would entail surrender of all claim to the northern territory and the acceptance of a status of vassal to the Chin seemed an ultimate disloyalty and dishonor to shih-tai-fu who loved their tradition and counted loyalty among the highest vitues.[1]

Supporters of war argued, moreover, that where the Chin were concerned an offensive was the best defense, and might even accomplish a restoration of territory and a permanent end to the Chin threat. It is with these supporters of continued war against the Chin that Ta-hui is alleged to have sided.

Between 1131 and 1134 an intermission in the struggle between the Chin and the Sung occurred while the Chin attempted to assimilate their conquests and the Sung to establish control of the south.

In 1134 Chang Chün, the minister who in 1137 would be responsible for Ta-hui's invitation to Ching-shan, was placed in charge of the Southern Sung Bureau of Military Affairs. In early 1135, prospects improved for the Sung. A major rebellion which had broken out in Hunan had been completely pacified. Chao Ting and Chang Chün were Left Executive and Right Executive of the Department of Ministries, and they seemed agreed upon an aggressive stance. In 1136 Yüeh Fei's army pushed to the north against the neighboring Chin puppet state, Ch'i, and secured a firm base

1. Kaplan, p. 369. On the nostalgia for Kaifeng, see Chiang Fu-tsung, "A City of Cathay" (Ching-ming Shang-ho t'u), Monumenta Serica, 1971, pp. 338-45.

north of the Yangtze.[1] Yueh was eager to push further toward the reconquest of the lost territories. The stage seemed set for renewed efforts to reconquer the north.

However, in 1130 a man named Ch'in Kuei 秦檜 had arrived at the Southern Sung court from the north, where he had been held captive in the party of the former emperors.[2] His escape from captivity and his progress southward with his wife had been miraculous--too miraculous, thought some who suspected that he had been "planted" by the Chin. He had immediately made it clear that his mission was to become Chief Minister in order to see peace concluded between the Sung and the Chin. In 1131 he had been appointed Second Privy Councillor.

His advocacy of peace at any price had aroused considerable opposition, and in 1132 he had been forced to step down from office. But in 1136, Chang Chün, no doubt feeling that the war party was securely in the ascendant, recommended that he be reinstated. In early 1137 the Emperor received news that his father Hui Tsung and the Ning-te Empress had died in captivity.[3] Ch'in Kuei seized the opportunity to urge peace once again. Chang Chün argued that filiality required the Emperor to fight his father's enemies, but Ch'in Kuei received a better hearing when he recommended peace and a negotiation for the return of the deceased.[4]

---

1. Kaplan, pp. 264-65, 307.

2. Kaplan gives a summary of Ch'in Kuei's career and captivity (pp. 150-51).

3. Kaplan, pp. 313-14. Hui Tsung had in fact died in 1135.

4. Kaplan, p. 353.

In the same year, the year of Ta-hui's appointment to the abbotship of Ching-shan, the "war party" received a terrible blow. A sub-commander, Li Ch'iung, defected with a large portion of his army to the Ch'i. Some 40,000 men surrendered to the enemy with Li Ch'iung. Chang Chün's responsibility for failing to prevent this disaster cost him his career; he was instantly dismissed and exiled, not to serve again until 1161.[1] Chang Chün's fall from power must have occurred very shortly after Ta-hui took up his abbotship at Ching-shan; Ta-hui's position was not immediately affected by the dismissal of his patron.

After the dismissal of Chang Chün, Chao Ting was recalled and made Chief Minister. Although more cautious than Chang Chün, Chao Ting was in favor of an aggressive stance toward the Ch'i and the Chin, so that on the surface the war party had not fallen from power with Chang Chün. But in 1137 the Chin expressed a willingness to enter into negotiations about restoration of territory, principally Honan, to the Sung.[2] The Chin had conquered more than they could defend or govern comfortably; even though it would have assured their legitimacy as rulers of the Sung line, they had no desire to rule over all of China.

The Chin also offered to restore the coffins of the imperial family. On receiving this offer the court lost interest in reconquering territory that it might gain by diplomacy. The court had never believed it could conquer and hold more than Honan in any case. Furthermore, inflation, internal pacification problems, the Southern Sung's undistinguished

---

1. This episode is related in Kaplan (pp. 331-50).

2. Kaplan, pp. 356-60.

military record, the lack of military leaders of great firmness or resolve apart from Yüeh Fei, the unreliability of the armies as demonstrated by the recent defection of the subcommander Li Ch'iung and his 40,000 troops--all these factors made peace seem very attractive. Ch'in Kuei's fortunes began to rise, while such heroic military men as Yüeh Fei began to seem mere roadblocks to peace. In early 1138 Ch'in Kuei was given positions that made him equal to Chao Ting, and very soon afterward Ch'in Kuei began to argue that if peace were to be made, those such as Chao Ting who were associated with war in the minds of the Chin and the populace would have to be removed from the bureaucracy. In 1138 Chao Ting was given a high provincial post that removed him from the capital; later he was hounded to death in a series of exiles further and further from Lin-an. Other members of the war party resigned, were dismissed, or moved over into Ch'in's clique.[1]

At the end of 1138, a peace was concluded with the Chin on the Chin's terms. Territories in Honan and Shensi provinces were ceded to the Sung. The Emperor's relatives were to remain in Chin territory as hostages.

This peace agreement was regarded by the stalwart members of the war party as a trap. Honan was indefensible against cavalry, and the Sung would have to build a second long line of defense in addition to their excellent entrenchments along the Yangtze. The Chin were merely ridding themselves of territory that nobody could hold. Furthermore,

---

1. Kaplan, pp. 368; 374.

it was clear that the period of negotiations had been used by the Chin as a breathing space to rebuild their armies. In 1140 the Chin moved troops into Honan and Shensi and officially denounced the peace agreement. In the face of this turn of events, even Ch'in Kuei talked of the need for military retaliation.

Yüei Fei, the Sung's only truly outstanding general, provided dramatic retaliation. He moved his army north almost to Kaifeng, the former Sung capital. The Chin fell back in a series of dramatic defeats, apparently unable to hold the Kaifeng region. Yüeh demanded permission to retake the former capital and advance across the Yellow river. For a moment it seemed that the hopes of the war party might be fulfilled. But Ch'in Kuei, whose power at court was virtually absolute, worked frantically behind the scenes to prevent Yüeh Fei from carrying out this plan. The court refused permission, and ordered Yüeh Fei to withdraw to the south. Yüeh Fei acquiesced, only to find himself in 1141 defending his position against an invasion of the south by the Chin. A valiant defense effort on the part of the Sung resulted in a military stalemate.

Such a stalemate was actually what Ch'in Kuei had been hoping would develop. He ordered Yüeh Fei and the other two leading generals to bureaucratic positions in the capital, and began peace negotiations once more. As before, the success of peace negotiations seemed to depend on the destruction of the symbols of war---in this case, the persons of Yüeh Fei and another general, Han Shih-chung. In the eleventh month of 1141, the Chin offered to establish the line of the Huai river as the boundary (this of course did not give the Sung either Honan or Shensi). The Sung were to pay annually 250,000 bolts of cloth and 250,000 ounces of silver.

When peace was concluded, Yüeh Fei was judicially murdered: the high court refused to convict Yüeh Fei of treason on the evidence, so Ch'in Kuei personally signed the death warrant early in 1142.

This event signalled a wave of purges of opponents of Ch'in Kuei and advocates of the war policy, leaving Ch'in Kuei in firm control of the bureaucracy for the remainder of his life. The historian Li Hsin-ch'uan estimates that fifty-three men were purged during the eighteen years of Ch'in's ministry from 1138 to 1156.[1] Ta-hui's banishment to Heng-chou in 1143 occurred as part of this purge. Ch'in identified Chao Ting and Ta-hui's patron Chang Chün as his major opponents; his own account of his valiant efforts to make peace vilified these two men with lies. Chao Ting, having been the less disgraced by his own errors, was singled out for the greatest opprobrium. Any connection with Chao Ting was cause for finding oneself denounced to the court and banished.[2]

During his lifetime no one dared to oppose Ch'in Kuei. But after his death many who had been banished under his regime were freed. Chang Chün and Ta-hui were among them.[3]

Kao Tsung, while deploring some of the excesses of Ch'in Kuei, continued to affirm the justification of the peace policy. When in 1156 Chang Chün sent up a communication to the court which discussed military

---

1. Quoted in Kaplan, p. 552.

2. Kaplan, p. 571.

3. SS, chüan 361.

affairs, he was ordered by the Emperor to return to his place of exile.[1] Ta-hui, however, encountered no further difficulties.

In 1161, the Chin attacked the south once again, breaking the peace treaty of 1141 for the first time. By the end of the year, and in the face of strong Sung defense, the Chin asked for peace negotiations. Kao Tsung, seeing peace negotiations in the offing, decided to abdicate in favor of his cousin Hsiao Tsung.[2] Hsiao Tsung, who had apparently never been fond of Ch'in Kuei, immediately rehabilitated the reputations of the old war faction and called Chang Chün back into office. Significantly, it was Hsiao Tsung who heaped honors upon Ta-hui between 1156 and 1163. In 1165 a new peace treaty was signed which restored Ch'in Kuei's peace of 1141, with a few changes in terminology and a reduced tribute.

E. Ta-hui and the Anti-peace Party

Ta-hui's alleged conversations with his student Chang Chiu-ch'eng were given as the reason for his banishment. Historians have wondered how close Ta-hui was to prominent opponents of the peace policy, and how deep his involvement in their opposition might have been. Who was Chang Chiu-ch'eng, who proved such a dangerous friend, and what foundation was there for the accusation against him and Ta-hui?

---

1. Kaplan, p. 578.

2. Hsiao Tsung was a descendent of T'ai Tsu in the seventh generation, whereas Kao Tsung was a descendent of T'ai Tsung. Kao Tsung had had only one son who had died earlier (Saeki Tomi and Chikusa Masaaki, eds., Tōyō no rekishi, VI: Sō no shin bunka [Tokyo: Jinbutsu Oraisha, 1977], p. 266 gives a geneology chart showing the relationship).

Chang Chiu-ch'eng was a rising young official and scholar at the time of Ta-hui's residence at Ching-shan. In 1132 Chang had passed the chin-shih exam first among the candidates.[1] He had risen to important positions in the Board of Rites and the Board of Punishments, and was appointed Lecturer-in-Waiting to the Emperor.[2] In 1138, he was commanded to give lectures to the Emperor on the Spring and Autumn Annals.[3] At no time did Chang Chiu-ch'eng hide his opposition to peace with the Chin. In the eighth month of 1140, he and six others memorialized the Emperor in opposition to concluding a treaty of peace with the Chin.[4] Ch'in Kuei, who had fought for peace, and who finally saw a treaty successfully negotiated in 1141, saw to it that Chang Chiu-ch'eng was banished to the Nan-an Military Region in Kiangsi in 1143.[5] In Chang Chiu-ch'eng's biography in the Sung-shih we find the following passage:

> [At that time] a monk of Ching-shan [named] Tsung-kao talked very well about the principles of Ch'an. A crowd studied with him. Chiu-ch'eng at that time was often among them. [Ch'in] Kuei was afraid of [Chang's]

---

1. SYHA, chüan 40, p. 1b (Kuang-wen shu-chü reprint edition I, p. 625; hereafter only volume and page of the Kuang-wen shu-chü edition will be cited, following the chüan and page numbers of the reprinted text); Japan Committee for the Sung Project, Sōdaishi nempyō (Nan Sō) (A chronological Table of the Sung Dynasty, Southern Sung [1127-1279]) (Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko, 1974), p. 32.

2. SS, chüan 374, biography of Chang Chiu-ch'eng.

3. Sōdaishi nempyō (Nan Sō), pp. 58-59.

4. Sōdaishi nempyō (Nan Sō), p. 65.

5. SS, chüan 374, biography of Chang Chiu-ch'eng.

> opinion. He ordered the Remonstrance Officer Chan Ta-fang to say that [Chang Chiu-ch'eng] and Tsung-kao spoke against the court's policies. [Chang Chiu-ch'eng] was banished to the Nan-an Military Region, where he stayed fourteen years.[1]

Chang Chiu-ch'eng in a letter to a friend described this period of his life as follows:

> My father died suddenly, and I felt so distressed that I wanted to die, but I couldn't. On the fourteenth of the fourth month, it would be 100 days since he died (an important memorial day--see Ch. V below). The Old Man of Ching-shan sees things with the eye of the Tao, and is able to transcend life and death. Studying under him are 1700 monks who tirelessly and singlemindedly pursue the Tao. I thought that if I spent some time with them, I would be a little better able to bear the pain of my father's death. So on that day [the fourteenth] I climbed the mountain [to Ta-hui's monastery on Ching-shan]; on the eighteenth I came down again, and by the end of the fourth month I had been assigned to the Nan-an Military Region.[2]

There can be no doubt that Ta-hui was closely associated with Chang Chiu-ch'eng in the latter's search for enlightenment and spiritual solace.[3] But in Ta-hui's writings we find no evidence that he ever

---

1. Ibid.

2. Nien-p'u, p. 10b. The Nien-p'u also gives another account of the events that preceded Ta-hui's banishment. In this account, Ta-hui, very pleased with Chang Chiu-ch'eng's accomplishments in his Ch'an practice, publically compared Chang Chiu-Ch'eng's Ch'an to the Bow of the Divine Arm (shen pi kung 神臂弓), a weapon invented in the Sung, and made up a gāthā in which this simile was the main theme. It happened that the government was considering the use of this weapon at this time, so that Ta-hui's repeated use of the term was interpreted as a comment on policy (Nien-p'u, p. 10a-b).

3. The close connection between Chang Chiu-ch'eng and Ta-hui is attested in Confucian and Buddhist sources alike. Chang Chiu-ch'eng acknowledged Ta-hui as his teacher in his Hsin-ch'uan lu, 心傳錄 as quoted both in the Confucian SYHA and Buddhist historical works such as the Wu-teng

voiced an opinion on policy questions. What other evidence might be adduced in support of Ch'in Kuei's accusation that Ta-hui criticized the peace policy or was closely linked to the effort to continue the war against the Chin?

First, of course, one cannot forget the political position and policy stance of Ta-hui's sponsor at the capital, Chang Chün.[1] Ta-hui's association with Chang Chün alone could have caused Ch'in Kuei to wish to remove Ta-hui from the capital. Even out of office, Chang Chün was, with Chao Ting, one of the two most powerful opponents of Ch'in Kuei and his policy.

Second, a glance at the list of those who received letters from Ta-hui prior to and after his banishment suggests that Ta-hui did tend to associate with men whom Ch'in Kuei regarded as his opponents. (See Table I). The following eleven of those of Ta-hui's lay disciples and associates with whom he corresponded were notable as opponents of Ch'in Kuei.

The first of these was Tseng K'ai 曾開.[2] He passed the chin-shih in 1103, and rose to high positions in the Board of Punishments and Board of Rites after a varied career. Some of his spirited and learned arguments with Ch'in Kuei have been recorded by historians, who portray Tseng K'ai as a man who could put Ch'in Kuei down because he staunchly stood for virtue over expediency and knew his Confucian classics and history far

---

hui-yüan (chüan 20, Zokuzōkyō 2, 11, 4, p. 402a-d). Buddhist historical works always list Chang Chiu-ch'eng as Ta-hui's Dharma-heir. Chu Hsi and other Confucian sources blame Chang Chiu-ch'eng's association with Ta-hui for the Ch'an-like flavor of Chang's interpretations of Confucian classics (see note 2, p. 99 below). Even the Sung-shih mentions Chang's closeness to Ta-hui (chüan 374).

1. See page 29 above.

2. SS, chüan 382.

better then did Ch'in Kuei.[1] In 1138, at the peak of his career, we find him invited to lecture to the emperor on the San-ch'ao pao-hsun 三朝寶訓.[2] In 1139, he and Yin Tun informed the Emperor of their opposition to concluding peace.[3] Subsequently Tseng K'ai was forced by Ch'in Kuei to resign his post in the capital. He was offered another at a distance from the capital, but pleaded ill health and ended his life in retirement.[4] His vocal and staunch opposition won him a place on the list of those honored by later historians as having opposed Ch'in Kuei's peace plan.[5]

Chang Chiu-ch'eng's connection with Ta-hui and his opposition to peace has been discussed above. Suffice it to say that he was regarded by historians as one of the strongest opponents of peace.[6] In 1140, when Chang made his opposition formal and public, he was joined by a student of his, Fan Kuang-yüan.

---

1. SS, chuan 382.

2. Sōdaishi nempyō (Nan Sō), p. 58. He was Reader-in-waiting at the time.

3. Sōdaishi nempyō (Nan Sō), p. 59.

4. SS, chuan 382.

5. The list of those who opposed peace included in chüan 96 of the SYHAPI lists Tseng K'ai on p. 56a.

6. The list of opponents of peace in chüan 96 of SYHAPI lists Chang Chiu-ch'eng on p. 55b.

Fan Kuang-yüan 樊光遠 (1102-1164),[1] had passed the _chin-shih_ exam in 1135 at the age of 33. For his opposition to peace he was demoted and sent to an unimportant post far from the capital. He too won honor from the historians for his public opposition to Ch'in Kuei's policies.[2]

Fu Chih-jou 富直柔 was the grandson of the illustrious Northern Sung minister Fu Pi 富弼.[3] He passed the _chin-shih_ exam in 1128. He is not known for his public opposition to the peace plan, but he did lose his position on the Board of Rites because his failure to give Ch'in Kuei precedence over another minister angered Ch'in Kuei.[4] This act may well have been interpreted correctly by Ch'in Kuei as a form of public protest.

Liu Tzu-yü 劉子羽 (1097-1146)[5] was a military man, with close military connections to Chang Chün. He had a long and active career in the crucial years of war with the Chin, and in the end was forced to resign by Ch'in Kuei.[6]

---

1. _SYHA_, _chüan_ 40, p. 23a (I, p. 636). _Sōdaishi nempyō (Nan So)_, p. 65.

2. The list of opponents of peace in _chüan_ 96 of _SYHAPI_ lists Fan as an opponent of peace (p. 57b).

3. _SS_, _chüan_ 375. For Fu Pi, see _SS_, _chüan_ 313 and _SYHA_, _chüan_ 3, p. 21 (I, p. 88), among many other sources.

4. _SS_, _chüan_ 375.

5. _SS_, _chüan_ 370, _SYHAPI_, _chüan_ 1, p. 83a.

6. _SS_, _chüan_ 370.

Lü Pen-chung (1048-1145) began his association with Ch'in Kuei with a favorable attitude toward him;[1] at one point the two held the same office. But in 1138 he was forced to resign and take an honorary post, and was branded by Ch'in Kuei as a member of the anti-peace faction.[2] This ended his career and he died not long afterward.

Wang Ying-ch'en 汪應辰 (1119-1176) was a strong opponent of peace who twice had to resign from positions at the capital due to opposition to Ch'in Kuei.[3] He passed the chin-shih in 1135 at the top of the list. The first time that Ch'in Kuei reassigned him to the provinces he resigned, and went to live in a temple, where he took up teaching.[4] The second time, Ch'in Kuei sent him to Kuang-chou.[5] Wang's early connection with Chao Ting,[6] who discovered and encouraged his talent, may have affected his later political fate, for Chao Ting was one of Ch'in Kuei's most powerful opponents. After Ch'in Kuei's death Wang Ying-ch'en returned to the capital and occupied important positions.[7]

---

1. SS, chüan 376.
2. SS, chüan 376.
3. SS, chüan 387.
4. SYHA, chüan 46, p. 2a (I, p. 696).
5. SS, chüan 387; SYHA, chüan 46, p. 2b (I, p. 696).
6. SS, chüan 387; SYHA, chüan 46, p. 1b (I, p. 695).
7. SS, chüan 387, SYHA, chüan 46, p. 3a-b (I, p. 696).

Tseng T'ien 曾怗 opposed Ch'in Kuei and the peace plan, but took ıe precaution of removing himself from the scene. Early in Ch'in Kuei's ;cendency he took an honorary post as head of a Taoist temple and retired :om public life for the rest of the period.[1]

Li Mi-cheng 李彌正 was a man about whom we know little, except that ɜ opposed Ch'in Kuei in a memorial and was barred from office for twenty ɜars.[2]

Hsiang Tzu-yin 向子諲 [3] (1085-1152 or 1086-1153) ended his life Eter fifteen years of retirement brought about by the fact that he ɔuldn't bow to the Chin ambassador in token of the submission of a :ibutary vassal to his lord. He asserted that in history nothing equaled ıe infamy of such submission. This stance, needless to say, brought ɔout his retirement in 1137 or 1138.[4]

Finally, Lou Chao 樓炤 (1108-1160), whose correspondence with Ta-ıi occurred after the death of Ch'in Kuei and Ta-hui's restoration to ıe capital,[5] was honored by historians as an opponent of peace.[6]

· SYHA, chüan 24, pp. 19b-20a (I, pp. 456-57).

· SYHA, chüan 4, p. 37b (I, p. 120).

· SS, chüan 377.

· SS, chüan 377.

· SS, chüan 380; SYHAPI, chüan 19, p. 113b.

The list in SYHAPI, chüan 96 lists Lou as an opponent of peace on 55b.

It is only natural that we should find many opponents of peace among those whose letters from Ta-hui dated from the period of his exile, for at that time Ta-hui was known as an opponent of Ch'in Kuei, and the latter's friends would hardly have sought him out. Nonetheless, most of Ta-hui's acquaintances among shih-tai-fu during this period must have known him before 1143, for in Heng-chou and Mei-chou he had face-to-face contact with few of these high officials. Via letters and communications through other students, Ta-hui maintained during this period of exile a network of lay students, most of whom were opponents of peace or enemies of Ch'in Kuei and were living in retirement or banishment, or were occupying obscure provincial posts.

Ta-hui's association with so many members of the anti-peace party, and his banishment along with Chang Chiu-ch'eng ostensibly for discussing court policies, raises some very interesting but on available evidence unanswerable questions. Was Ta-hui in fact a partisan in the controversy raging around Ch'in Kuei's attempts to make peace? Was he one who was willing to violate his required neutrality as a monk in order to throw his influence behind a particular party and its policies, especially as he saw them losing ground to the peace faction? Should Ta-hui be held up to twentieth century Buddhists as a model of righteous political involvement as some, notably Araki Kengo, have wished to do?[1] Or, on the other hand, was Ta-hui a corrupt monk-politician, more interested

---

1. Cf. Araki Kengo, Daie sho (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1969), pp. 252-59; and Araki Kengo, Bukkyō to Jukyō, pp. 203-09.

in maintaining his friendships with politically powerful individuals than in practicing and teaching the Dharma alone? Or, even worse, did he represent a strain of "nationalistic Buddhism" similar to that which Japan experienced in the 1930's and 1940's? Did Ta-hui in particular, and Sung Buddhism in general, display a too-ready willingness to identify the national interest with the teachings of Buddhism?[1]

These questions, which are not only tantalizing but relevant to the question of whether Ta-hui can serve as an example to politically and socially concerned Buddhists today, regrettably cannot be answered on the evidence available either in Ta-hui's own writings and recorded sayings or in the Nien-p'u and later biographies.[2] There is simply no direct conclusive evidence in these sources concerning what Ta-hui did to bring about his defrocking and banishment, nor, other than the evidence of his friendships, as to what his political stance, if any, might have been. Nonetheless, although he appears to have accepted the close ties between the Ch'an sangha and the court already suggested by the evidence of national Ch'an monasteries under government control, it seems probable from the evidence of sincerity, singlemindedness and vigor with which Ta-hui preached and taught the Ch'an path to enlightenment, and from the number and quality of his Dharma-heirs, that Ta-hui was not simply a corrupt monk-politician.

---

1. Two prominent students of Ch'an history, Yanagida Seizan in his "Chūgoku Zenshū shi," pp. 95-97, and Abe Jōichi in his Chūgoku Zenshū shi no kenkyū (Tokyo: Seishin Shobo, 1963), pp. 457-476 and p. 25 of the "Outline" in English, agree in describing the Buddhism of Ta-hui and his circle as having a strong nationalistic flavor.

2. Whether other Sung sources would contribute more conclusive evidence remains a subject for future investigation.

Ta-hui protested that his loyalty and righteousness were, despite his monastic status and his commitment to Buddhist teachings, the equal of any Confucian scholar-official,[1] and this claim, however one wishes to evaluate it, rings true. Ta-hui was clearly at home in the culture of the educated scholar-officials; it does not require a great leap of imagination to suppose that he, like his friends, felt a desire to shape the direction taken by his culture and nation at a moment of crisis. Likewise, it seems probable that, however scrupulously he avoided the subject of politics, his friendships with laymen, though unquestionably based on mutual interest in Buddhist teachings and practice, could not have avoided reflecting, in the heated political climate of the time, a certain kind of concern for the nation. For reasons which will become clear in later chapters, it seems possible that, for Ta-hui, bringing to enlightenment laymen in positions of political and cultural leadership, clarifying and supporting the deepest elements in Confucian scholar-official culture, and assisting the nation in a time of weakness might well have been mutually supportive, fully compatible goals.

---

1. Yü-lu, Taishō 47, p. 912c.

TABLE I

NAMES & DATES	CHIN-SHIH DEGREE	DATES OF KNOWN CONTACT WITH TA-HUI	BIOGRAPHICAL SOURCES		WAR PARTY INVOLVEMENT
1. Tseng K'ai 曾開	1103	1134	SS	382	Strong, Protested against peace without return of queen and former emperors. Forced to resign.
			SYHA	26	
				34	
			SYHAPI	96	
2. Li Ping 李邴 1085-1146	1106	1135	SS	375	
			SYHAPI	1	
3. Fu Chih-jou 富直柔 ?-1156	1128	1138	SS	375	Repeated conflict with Ch'in Kuei.
4. Liu Tzu-yü 劉子羽 1097-1146	1102-1106 (takes office)	1139	SS	370	Strong involvement with Chang Chün; Many military responsibilities.
			SYHAPI	1	
5. Liu Tzu-hui 劉子翬 1101-1147		1139	SS	434	None except through Tzu-yü
			SYHA	43	
				16	
			SYHAPI	43	
				1	
				34	
				36	
				39	

TABLE I CONTINUED

NAMES & DATES	CHIN-SHIH DEGREE	DATES OF KNOWN CONTACT WITH TA HUI	BIOGRAPHICAL SOURCES		WAR PARTY INVOLVEMENT
6. Chang Chün 張浚		1137	SS	361	Strong.
1097-1164		1139	SYHA	44	
				30	
				40	
				99	
			SYHAPI	44	
				2	
7. Chang Kao 張杲	unknown	1140	SYHAPI	30	No information.
8. Wang Tsao 汪藻		1143	SS	445	Out of office
1079-1154			SYHAPI	6	during Ch'in's
				25	ministership.
				35	Attacked Ch'in
				98	early.
9. Lü Pen-chung 呂本中	1098-1100	1133	SS	376	Branded a member of
1048-1145		1143	SYHA	36	anti-peace party by
				20	Ch'in Kuei.
				23	
				25	
				26	
				27	
				29	
				35	
			SYHAPI	36	
				19	

NAMES & DATES	CHIN-SHIH DEGREE	DATES OF KNOWN CONTACT WITH TA-HUI	BIOGRAPHICAL SOURCES	WAR PARTY INVOLVEMENT
(Lü Pen-chung)			23	
			44	
10. Wang Ying-ch'en 汪應辰	1135	1144	SS 387	Out of office
1119-1176		1140	SYHA 46	twice due to
			25	Ch'in Kuei; after
			34	Ch'in Kuei's death
			36	he took an im-
			40	portant post at
			44	capital.
			SYHAPI 46	
			30	
			44	
			99	
11. Li Kuang 李光	1106	1149	SS 363	He was banished
1078-1159			SYHA 20	for opposing
			SYHAPI 20	Ch'in Kuei.
			5	
12. Tseng T'ien 曾恬		1146	SYHA 24	Retired to hon-
			20	orary post because
			25	of Ch'in Kuei
			35	
			SYHAPI 24	

NAMES & DATES	CHIN-SHIH DEGREE	DATES OF KNOWN CONTACT WITH TA-HUI	BIOGRAPHICAL SOURCES		WAR PARTY INVOLVEMENT
13. Liu Ts'en 劉岑 1087-1167		1148	SYHAPI	3	No information.
14. Li Mi-cheng 李彌正		1149	SYHA	4	Sent a memorial criticizing Ch'in Kuei; out of office for 20 years.
15. Li Mo 李謨 1082-1153	1106	1148	SYHAPI	1	No information.
16. Hsiang Tzu-yin 向子諲 1085-1152 or 1186-1153	1100 (first post)	1149	SS SYHAPI	377 20 25	Strong; opposed Ch'in Kuei; wouldn't bow to the Chin.
17. Yang Ju-nan 楊汝南	1145	1141-1150	SYHAPI	16 44	
18. Lou Chao 樓炤 1088-1160	1115	1157	SS	380	Strong.

TABLE I CONTINUED

	NAME & DATES	CHIN-SHIH DEGREE	DATES OF KNOWN CONTACT WITH TA-HUI	BIOGRAPHICAL SOURCES		WAR PARTY INVOLVEMENT
19.	Chang Hsiao-hsiang 張孝祥 1132-1170	1154	1159	SS SYHA SYHAPI	389 41 41 44	
20.	Fan Kuang-yuan 樊光遠 1102-1164	1135		SYHA SYHAPI	40 40 96	Strong; forced to quit post by Ch'in Kuei; publically opposed peace
21.	Chang Chiu-ch'eng 張九成 1092-1159	1132	1143	SYHA SYHAPI SS	40 25 40 12 44 96 374	Strong. Banished on Ch'in Kuei's order to Nan-an Military Region.
22.	T'ang Ssu-t'ui 湯思退 ?-1164			SS	371	Periods of agreement and of conflict with Ch'in Kuei; involved in intrigues against Ch'in Kuei's peace plan.

Chapter II: Ta-hui and Confucian Teaching: Tao-Hsüeh

As we have seen in Chapter I, Ta-hui spent his life preaching and teaching to and under the sponsorhsip of laymen from the scholar-official class. One important characteristic shared by many of his lay students and acquaintances was belonging to a movement in Confucian scholarship and self-cultivation later called the Tao-hsüeh movement: that is, they were what is usually called in English "Sung Neo-Confucians," members of a tradition of teaching and learning that had its origin in the Northern Sung.

A. Sung Confucians and Tao-hsüeh: a Historical Sketch

The Northern Sung period was one which in its first century (960-1060) enjoyed a marvelous sense of optimism. Rising agricultural productivity, vigorous commercial and industrial growth, and a hundred years of peace no doubt encouraged such optimism. But another cause of optimism was the appearance of a generation of great scholars, writers and political thinkers who were given high posts in government. The generation that included such men as Fan Chung-yen 范仲淹 (989-1052), Ou-yang Hsiu 欧陽修 and Su Shih 蘇軾 (better known as Su Tung-p'o 蘇東坡) won enduring fame in the Chinese tradition for providing brilliant leadership.[1]

---

1. In addition to the standard works and the works cited in the Introduction above, the summary of the history of the Northern and early Southern Sung given in the following pages in particularly indebted to Winston Wan Lo, The Life and Thought of Yeh Shih (Gainesville: University Presses of Florida; and Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 1974); Michael Dennis Freeman, "Loyang and the Opposition

Optimism was not confined to the political sphere; the outstanding scholars of this generation saw themselves as a "new wave" that could restore the true brilliance of Confucian learning. The "new wave" saw itself as a conservative force, aiming to restore the true meaning of the earliest classics and the early historical golden ages of the Chinese tradition. Scholars as Fan Chung-yen, Ou-yang Hsiu, and Wang An-shih 王安石 displayed a great interest in the "three dynasties" (Hsia, Yin and Chou). There was general agreement that Sung scholars must return directly to the texts of the classics and form their own interpretations of the true meaning of the ancients; commentaries from the Han and T'ang were felt now to be inferior works that distorted the great tradition. In literary style scholars enthusiastically followed the model of Han Yü's 韓愈 ku-wen 古文 prose essays. Historians took the ancient Spring and Autumn Annals as the model for the writing of history.

One idea that gained in popularity during this period was the idea that the true Tao of the sages had been passed down from sage to sage by a transmission of mind (hsin 心). This idea was thought to have entered the Confucian tradition with Han Yü (768-824), although it had been for many centuries an important idea in Chinese Buddhism, particularly in

---

to Wang An-shih: The Rise of Confucian Conservatism, 1068-1086," (unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale University, 1973); James T. C. Liu, Reform in Sung China (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959); Thomas Metzger, Escape From Predicament (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976); A. C. Graham, Two Chinese Philosophers (London: Lund Humphries, 1958).

Ch'an Buddhism.[1] Together with this interest in the "transmission of the Tao" (Tao-t'ung 道統) from mind to mind went an interest in the mind and personality of the sage himself. The question of what it is that makes a sage began once again to be of great interest to Confucians, who felt some optimism about their own possible progress toward that goal.

The political and ideological harmony of the period of the dominance of the new Confucian reformers from 1023 to 1069 was shattered by the rise to power of a Confucian scholar named Wang An-shih. Wang shared many characteristics with other scholars of the period: he had received an excellent Confucian education, was a good poet, made a fresh approach to the classics, and was strongly interested in sagehood.[2] One of the points on which he was most convinced was that bold, resolute reform was typical of the action of a sage. This was not a conviction with which other scholars would have differed: reform, even institutional reform, was the banner under which they had achieved greatness. Wang, however, preempted the reform banner by proposing a series of drastic reforms and attempting to put them into effect. The reforms in themselves were singly no more drastic than some that the other scholars

---

1. Cf. especially Carsun Chang, The Development of Neo-Confucian Thought, I (New York: Bookman Associates, 1957), pp. 98-100. Philip Yampolsky discusses the formation of Dharma-transmission lineages in the early Ch'an school (The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch [New York: Columbia University Press, 1967], pp. 1-57).

2. Lo, pp. 14-18; H. R. Williamson, Wang An-shih (London: Arthur Probsthain, 1937), II, pp. 294-318. Williamson has translated some of Wang An-shih's essays on sagehood (Wang An-shih, II, pp. 338-42).

had proposed or supported, but the effect of Wang's approach to their implementation was to split the educated elite of scholar-officials into two factions, the pro-Wang or "reform" faction and the anti-Wang and newly "anti-reform" faction. Wang successfully held power from 1071 to 1076,[1] and his faction kept power until 1085, while his opponents were removed from office. Among those removed were two cousins, Chang Tsai 張載 (1020-1077) and Ch'eng Hao 程顥 (T. Ming-tao 明道) (1032-1085). Chang Tsai returned to Heng-ch'ü 橫渠 in Shensi Province where he founded a school of Confucian learning. Ch'eng Hao, after serving in a few minor positions, went to Loyang to join his brother Ch'eng I 程頤 (T. I-ch'uan 伊川 1033-1107). The two men there founded a second school of Confucian learning, and taught together for almost ten years until Ch'eng Hao's death. These two schools were the beginning of the Tao-hsüeh movement. Chang Tsai's school disbanded after his death in 1077, and his teaching thereafter received very little attention for many years. Many of his most eminent students went to Loyang to study under the Ch'eng brothers.[2]

Many other influential exiles also retreated to the old capital of Loyang; the group in that city included Ssu-ma Kuang 司馬光 , leader of the anti-reform faction, and the eccentric Shao Yung 邵雍. This group that gathered in Loyang during the period of Wang's power was very diverse intellectually, and was united principally by opposition

---

1. Wang was made second privy councilor in 1069, first privy councilor in 1071 (Liu, Reform, pp. 3-4).

2. Graham, pp. xv-xvi.

to Wang and to institutional reform. During the period of their stay in Loyang a new interpretation of the meaning of Confucian life was formed which profoundly affected the development of the Tao-hsüeh movement.[1]

One of the features of life in Loyang and elsewhere during Wang's ascendency that affected the Tao-hsüeh movement was the fact of being out of office. Recognition as a true Confucian had always depended in the Northern Sung not upon adherence to an explicit set of philosophic attitudes, but rather on the degree to which one acted as a good Confucian should. A man proved his worth as a Confucian in the 1040's and 1050's by what he did, and particularly by his devotion to the pursuit of virtuous conduct and policy in government office. Now devoted government servants suffered a forced retirement from active life. This necessitated a new interpretation of the arena in which one must cultivate one's Confucian virtue. A new conviction grew that sagehood was something one could attain anywhere, even in the privacy of one's own home. Perhaps the goal of sagehood must even be sought in a special way; the Tao-hsüeh scholars went so far as to give the impression that exertions along the line of the normal career of the scholar-official were irrelevant to the goal of becoming a sage. Pastimes which would have been deemed inappropriate for the committed Confucian were re-evaluated: painting, for example, hitherto a technical art or a mere

---

1. This is the argument of Freeman's dissertation.

recreation for the scholar, was now understood, as we see in Su Shih's theory of painting, as a true reflection of the Confucian spirit.[1]

Intellectually, too, a number of studies that would not have been indulged in by officials in busier times were now taken up by Confucians out of office. For example, numerological studies flourished among the intellectual community of exiles in Loyang. Cosmology was also an important interest of many of the Loyang group. Although the Ch'eng brothers took pains to distinguish their own teachings from the popular cosmological interests in "numbers and symbols," insisting that "there must be principle before there can be forms and symbols; there must be forms and symbols before there can be numbers...,"[2] and stressing that one should not waste one's time investigating the secondary, many other anti-reform exiles of the Loyang Tao-hsüeh group showed an active interest: the cosmologies of Shao Yung and Ssu-ma Kuang developed during this time are only the most famous.[3] The question of what it is that makes a sage was taken up in a more systematic fashion. Even history took on new meaning as the working out of a moral and cosmic order, not

---

1. Cf. Osvald Sirén, The Chinese on the Art of Painting (New York: Schocken Books, 1963), pp. 52-63.

2. Quoted in Freeman, pp. 217-18.

3. Shao Yung's ideas are well known. Wing-tsit Chan has translated portions of Shao's most famous work, the Huang-chi ching-shih shu 皇極經世書 (Supreme Principles Governing the World), in his A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963), pp. 484-94. Ssu-ma Kuang wrote the Ch'ien-hsü 潛虛 (Hidden Void), a numerological work which has been thought to have been written in imitation of the T'ai-hsüan ching 太玄經 (Classic of the Supremely Profound Principle) of Yang Hsiung 楊雄 (53 B.C.-A.D. 18).

simply as a collection of precedents and examples useful to guide practical policy decisions.

The rejection of institutional reform as a means for improving government hardened into an orthodoxy among the exiles of Loyang whose common bond was opposition to Wang An-shih. Yet this conservatism was not pessimistic, for men like the Ch'eng brothers and Ssu-ma Kuang believed that men could be perfected, not through institutional reform but through the performance of everyday tasks. An inner transformation of attitude was the key to perfection in the Way and to good government; since, as the Ch'eng brothers demonstrated, principle was in all things, that learning which brought about transformation of inner attitude and sagely realization of the Way could take place anywhere, in or out of office.[1]

A new attitude toward learning itself accompanied this new interest in the seeking of sageliness. In 1050, Ch'eng I was writing disapprovingly of the wrong approach to education, noting that "men do not seek within themselves but outside themselves, and engage in extensive learning, effortful memorization, clever style, and elegant diction, making their words elaborate and beautiful. Thus few have arrived at the Way...."[2] Learning was not to be sought in memorization and cultivation of skills, all of which were mere externals; true learning was to be sought within oneself.

---

1. Cf. Freeman, p. 220.

2. Ch'eng Tuan-chung, ed., I-ch'uan wen-chi, in K'ang Shao-tsung, ed., Erh-Ch'eng ch'üan-shu, Ssu-pu-pei-yao edition, chüan 4, p. 2a. Quoted in Chan, Source Book, p. 550.

To the ambitions of true learning no boundaries were set. In the Northern Sung, scholars claimed to have recovered the Tao which had been untransmitted since the time of Mencius some 12-1300 years earlier. They wrote essays that became new classics, and felt that they were making known truths which the sages of former times had not revealed.[1] Men as politically at odds as Ch'eng I and Wang An-shih both claimed that no one before them understood or knew how to understand the classics. Scholars felt a sense of mission to bring to the world a fresh and more profound exposition of the truth.

The Tao-hsüeh movement that began in the Northern Sung was not a closely defined doctrine, an orthodoxy. It was not a set teaching handed down strictly from particular masters to disciples with each generation making additions and changes but leaving the central points of the teaching intact. Such a pattern of schools, masters and disciples can be seen in the later Southern Sung, and is a major characteristic of the intellectual life of that time.[2] In the Northern Sung, men like Ch'eng brothers and Ssu-ma Kuang were free to draw on a wide range of intellectual resources. The fact that Ssu-ma Kuang, famous historian

---

1. Cf. Ch'eng I's reply to Yang Shih's letter on Chang Tsai's "Western Inscription," in I-ch'uan wen-chi, Ssu-pu-pei-yao edition, chüan 5, p. 12b, translated in Chan, Source Book, pp. 550-51. Ch'eng I says: "As a written work, however, the 'Western Inscription' extends principle to cover all in order to preserve righteousness..., thus expounding on something that previous sages had not expressed."

2. Freeman, p. 175; cf. also p. 85.

and political leader, developed during this period a numerological cosmology allegedly in imitation of Yang Hsiung 楊雄 indicates the rang of intellectual concerns and resources upon which Confucians were willing to draw.

Ssu-ma Kuang and the anti-reformers regained power at court in 1085, but lost it once more to the followers of Wang An-shih, the "reform party," in 1093.[1] (Wang himself had died in 1086.) Ch'eng I served briefly as a tutor to the young emperor in 1086-7.[2] After 1093 a purge of the anti-reform party and a literary inquisition took place. Ch'eng I, for example, was exiled to Fu-chou 涪州 in Szechwan in 1097, and his teachings were proscribed. His teachings were banned again in 1103. Ch'eng I felt himself to be in such danger at this time that he disbanded his disciples.[3] Through such measures the "reform party" in power managed to impose a narrow orthodoxy on the intellectual life of the time. Books by authors such as Su Shih and Ssu-ma Kuang were also proscribed, and book sellers were warned not to possess them or print them.[4]

Wang An-shih had written or sponsored works such as the San-ching hsin-i 三經新義, his own "new commentaries on three classics,"

---

1. Lo, p. 23; Williamson, II, pp. 399-400.

2. Graham, p. xvi.

3. Ibid.; Freeman, p. 216.

4. Lo, p. 24. Attempts were made to destroy the printing blocks of Ssu-ma Kuang's Tzu-chih t'ung-chien 資治通鑑 (Comprehensive Mirror in Aid of Government) in the imperial printing office (Freeman, p. 216).

and the Tzu-shuo 字說 , a treatise on the derivation of words.[1] These had been made standard works for the examination system, and were now made so again, as the "reform party" continued to make Wang An-shih's thought into an orthodoxy.

With the invasion of the north by the Chin and the founding of the Southern Sung came a new attack on Wang An-shih's ideology. The reformers had been in power during the last 32 years of the Northern Sung; they and their ideology were blamed for the dynasty's loss of territory. Early in the Southern Sung, intellectuals called for a return to the wisdom of the dynasty's founding fathers. The institutions established by the first emperors of the dynasty were seen as possessing a peculiar fitness to the needs of the empire; all had been lost by the reformers' desire to abandon them. Historians collected "Records of the Words and Deeds of Outstanding [Northern] Ministers" as a model from which the dynasty should not again depart.[2]

Most of the scholar-officials active in the early Southern Sung had been brought up on Wang An-shih's San-ching hsin-i and Tzu-shuo. After the move to the south, scholars came to reject much of the specific content expressed in these works, but their attitudes toward learning were much affected nonetheless. From Wang they retained an interest in

---

1. Lo, p. 20; Williamson, II, p. 302. The three classics were the Odes, the History, and the Chou Li. Wang actually wrote only the Chou Li commentary. Wang's commentary on the Chou Li in 16 chüan, the Chou Kuan hsin-i, is available in a recent photoreprint published in Taiwan by the Commercial Press in 1975. The Tzu-shuo ("Exegetical Explanation of Words") is lost.

2. Lo, pp. 25-27; Freeman, p. 137, and pp. 144-50. Yang Shih's call for the repeal of Wang's San-ching hsin-i is well known. Cf. Chang, p. 235.

self-cultivation and cosmological theorizing; a tendency to downgrade historical empiricist scholarship; a view of knowledge as instrumental, important as a means of transforming oneself and the world; and the view that the previous thousand years of China's past represented a deterioration of China's true culture and Way, and that now in the Sung complete innovation was needed in scholarly interpretation of classics, if not in the realm of institutional reform.[1]

With the discrediting at the beginning of the Southern Sung of the specific content of Wang An-shih's ideology, the Tao-hsüeh movement, which shared many of these attitudes, was in an excellent position to fill the vacuum. The Tao-hsüeh movement had been an eccentric, avant-garde movement in the Northern Sung. Now in the early Southern Sung it achieved a great popularity, particularly in the form given to it by Ch'eng I. Among the various strands of Tao-hsüeh, Ch'eng I's teaching was particularly suited to the conservative tenor of the time because Ch'eng I developed his ideas within the framework of the classics, not in the framework of cosmological systems. His pedagogical approach was that learning should be open to everyone. He too had a instrumental view of knowledge as a means of transforming the self. His teaching was different from that of Wang An-shih, yet similar to Wang An-shih's in important respects. Like Wang An-shih's, his scholarship avoided political topics, emphasized the classics, and was interested in the profundities of Mind. All of these things made Ch'eng I's version

1. Cf. Lo, pp. 33-34.

of Tao-hsüeh the most appealing to a generation brought up on the writings and interpretations of Wang An-shih. It is not surprising that Ch'eng I's disciples were prominent among the early leaders of the Southern Sung.

Later, with Ch'in Kuei, the leader of the peace faction, official patronage shifted back to the learning of Wang An-shih. But Tao-hsüeh had gained considerable momentum by 1138 and could never again be totally eclipsed.[1]

Ta-hui, of course, grew up and received his basic Confucian education during the ascendency of the Wang An-shih reform party, and presumably had his first contact with Confucian classics through Wang An-shih's commentaries. His recorded teachings, however, date from the first 35 years of the Southern Sung, and the letters of his that have been preserved also date from that period. The first ten years of this period was the period of the relative ascendency of Ch'eng I's Tao-hsüeh at the Southern Sung court. In 1131, for example, we find Ch'eng I recognized by the court, and his grandson invited to court for an audience with the emperor.[2] These actions, though, were clearly still controversial. In 1137 a Remonstrance Official urged that the scholarship of the Ch'engs be banned, and that the emperor Kao Tsung and the scholar-officials should take Confucius and Mencius directly as their

---

1. Lo, pp. 29-35.

2. Sōdaishi nempyō (Nan Sō), pp. 27, 28, and 29.

teachers.[1] In 1137, we find Hu An-kuo 胡安國 asking that Shao Yung, Chang Tsai and the two Ch'eng brothers be honored by sacrifices in the temple of Confucius. For this he was attacked.[2] But in 1137 the Ch'eng brothers and their disciple Yin Tun 尹焞 were honored as teachers.[3] In 1138 we find five prominent members of the Ch'eng line, including Yin Tun, Chang Chiu-ch'eng and Lü Pen-chung, invited to give lectures to the emperor.[4] The prominence of Hu An-kuo and Yin Tun at the court throughout the period up to 1138 (when Hu An-kuo died and Yin Tun joined Tseng K'ai in telling the emperor that peace was the wrong policy, then resigned), is itself testimony to the prominence of the Ch'eng I line at the time.[5] In 1144, after the victory of Ch'in Kuei's peace party had been fully secured, we find a memorial showing that Ch'eng I's teaching had been rejected by the court.[6]

The majority of Ta-hui's scholar-official friends of which we have record were made during this time of the relative power of Ch'eng I's students and their students. We find that a rather striking number of Ta-hui's lay acquaintances of record are said to have learned their

---

1. Sōdaishi nempyō (Nan Sō), p. 54.

2. Sōdaishi nempyō (Nan Sō), p. 55. For biographical information on Hu An-kuo, see SYHA, chuan 34.

3. Ibid. For biographical information on Yin Tun, see SS, chuan 428 and SYHA, chuan 27.

4. Sōdaishi nempyō (Nan Sō), pp. 58-59.

5. Sōdaishi nempyō (Nan Sō), p. 58 (Hu An-kuo's death); p. 59 (Yin Tun's remonstrance).

6. Sōdaishi nempyō (Nan Sō), pp. 73-74.

Confucian scholarship from teachers prominent in the Tao-hsüeh line. This is particularly true of those of his lay students who were active as scholars and teachers.

B. Ta-hui's Disciples and Tao-hsüeh

Twenty-two of the laymen to whom Ta-hui wrote letters preserved in the *Ta-hui shu* were prominent enough to have biographies or records preserved in the *Sung-shih*, the *Sung Yüan hsüeh-an*, or its continuation, the *Sung Yüan hsüeh-an pu-i*. Of these twenty-two laymen, the majority studied with teachers who were in a direct line of transmission of teaching from either the Ch'eng brothers or Ssu-ma Kuang (see Table II).

In the following paragraphs a brief description is given of the connection of the laymen with the Ch'engs and Ssu-ma Kuang:

Liu Tzu-hui 劉子翬,[1] a student of Ta-hui's who is famous as a teacher of the young Chu Hsi, is said to have been a follower of Ch'eng I.[2] He is also said to be one who understood the Ch'eng brothers teaching without having studied under them directly.[3] He was remembered as a

---

1. Biographical information in *SS*, *chüan* 434; *SYHA*, *chüan* 43, p. 5a-b; and *SYHAPI*, *chüan* 43, p. 4a; 1, p. 83b; 34, p. 31a; 36, p. 6b; 39, p. 14b; and 44, p. 15b.

2. *SYHAPI*, *chüan* 43, p. 4a; *SYHA*, *chüan* 15, *piao* p. 2b (I, p. 290).

3. *SYHA*, *chüan* 16, p. 19b (I, p. 325).

fellow student of Hu An-kuo,[1] and a friend of Lü Pen-chung[2] and Chang Chün.[3]

Lü Pen-chung 呂本中 [4] had many ties to the Ch'eng brothers' line of transmission. His grandfather Lü Hsi-che 呂希哲 had been a disciple of the Ch'engs.[5] Pen-chung himself had studied under Yang Shih 楊時,[6] thus qualifying as a second generation disciple of the Ch'engs, for Yang Shih had studied under both brothers. Lü Pen-chung also studied under Yu Tso 游酢,[7] another direct disciple of the Ch'engs. He apparently studied longest with Yin Tun,[8] another disciple

1. SYHAPI, chüan 34, p. 31a. While Hu An-kuo apparently never studied under the Ch'engs directly, he was closely linked with many of those such as Yang Shih who had been direct disciples of the Ch'engs, and can almost be considered a member of the Ch'eng brothers' line of transmission. Biographical information for Hu An-kuo is in SYHA, chüan 34, pp. 1b-3a (I, pp. 562-63).

2. SYHAPI, chüan 43, p. 4a. For Lü Pen-chung, see below.

3. SYHAPI, chüan 44, p. 15b. For Chang Chün, see below.

4. Biographical information in SS 376; SYHA, chüan 36, pp. 1b-2b (I, p. 590). Additional information in SYHA, chüan 20, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29 and 35; SYHAPI, chüan 36, p. 1a; 19, p. 100b; 23, p. 13b; 44, p. 7a.

5. SYHA, chuan 23, piao p. 1a (I, p. 441).

6. SYHA, chüan 25, piao p. 1a (I, p. 459), and chüan 36, p. 2b (I, p. 590). Biographical information for Yang Shih in SS, chüan 428, and SYHA, chüan 25, pp. 1b-4b (I, pp. 461-62).

7. SYHA, chüan 26, piao p. 1a (I, p. 483), and SYHA, chüan 36, p. 2b (I, p. 590). See SYHA, chüan 26, and SS, chüan 428 for biographical information on Yu Tso.

8. SYHA, chüan 36, p. 2b (I, p. 590). For biographical information on Yin Tun, see SS, chüan, 428 and SYHA, chüan 27.

the Ch'engs. These are merely the most formative among a number of achers and friends he had in the Ch'eng line. Lü Pen-chung also udied under Liu An-shih 劉安世,[1] a student of Ssu-ma Kuang.

Tseng K'ai[2] 曾開 was a student of Yu Tso,[3] and was thus a second neration disciple of the Ch'engs. He also was a friend of Hu An-kuo.[4]

Tseng T'ien[5] 曾恬 studied under Yang Shih,[6] Hsieh Liang-tso 謝良佐,[7] Ch'en Kuan 陳瓘[8] and Liao Weng 了翁,[9] all of whom re students of the Ch'engs. He also studied under Liu An-shih,[10] and s thus part of the lineage of Ssu-ma Kuang. He was a recorder of ieh Liang-tso's Recorded Sayings.[11]

. SYHA, chüan 36 and chüan 20. For biographical information on Liu -shih see SYHA, chüan 20, pp. 1b-2b (I, p. 405).

. Biographical information in SYHA, chüan 26, p. 4a (I, p. 485) and , p. 10b (I, p. 567); SS, chüan 382; SYHAPI, chüan 96, p. 56a.

. SYHA, chüan 26, p. 4a (I, p. 485); SS, chüan 382.

. SYHA, chuan 34, p. 10b (I, p. 567).

. Biographical information in SYHA, chüan 24, pp. 19b-20a (I, pp. 456-7); 20, p. 18a (I, p. 413); 25, p. 29b (I, p. 475); 35, p. 11b; and YHAPI, chüan 24, p. 10a.

. SHYA, chüan 24, p. 19b (I, p. 456); SYHAPI, chüan 24, p. 10a.

. Ibid.

. SYHA, chüan 35, p. 18b (I, p. 586).

. SYHA, chüan 24, p. 19b (I, p. 456).

0. Ibid.

1. Ibid.

Hsiang Tzu-yin 向子諲 [1] was a friend of Hu An-kuo.[2] Although he is far more noted for action than for scholarship, he also studied under Liu An-shih,[3] and is listed in the lineage of Yang Shih.[4]

Yang Ju-nan 楊汝南,[5] about whom very little is known, is listed as a member of the Ch'eng school. So is Chang Kao 張杲 , about whom similarly little is recorded.[6]

Chang Chiu-ch'eng 張九成 ,[7] a prominent intellectual figure, studied under Yang Shih[8] and was closely identified with the Tao-hsüeh movement.

Fan Kuang-yüan 樊光遠 was in turn a disciple of Chang Chiu-ch'eng.[9]

---

1. Biographical information in SS, chüan 377; SYHAPI, chüan 20, pp. 12a-15a; 25, p. 75b.

2. SYHAPI, chüan 20, pp. 13a-b.

3. Ibid.

4. SYHAPI, chüan 25, p. 75b.

5. Biographical information in SYHAPI, chüan 16, p. 21b; 44, p. 76a.

6. SYHAPI, chüan 30, pp. 32a-b.

7. Biographical information in SYHA, chüan 40, pp. 1b-2a (I p. 625); 25, p. 18 (I, p. 469); SS, chüan 374; SYHAPI, chüan 40, p. 1b; 12, p. 56b; 44, p. 7a; 96, p. 55b.

8. SS, chüan 374.

9. Biographical information in SYHA, chüan 40, pp. 23a-b (I, p. 636); SYHAPI, chüan 40, p. 35b; 96, p. 57b.

Wang Ying-ch'en 汪應辰,[1] was also a student of Chang Chiu-ch'eng.[2] In addition, he was a student of Hu An-kuo[3] and Lü Pen-cheng.[4] He also studied under Yü Shu 喻樗,[5] a disciple of Yang Shih.[6]

Li Kuang 李光[7] was a disciple of Liu An-shih,[8] and thus was in the line of transmission of Ssu-ma Kuang.

Wang Tsao 汪藻,[9] a scholar who wrote many works, studied under Hsü Fu 徐俯,[10] a disciple of Yang.

---

1. Biographical information in SS, chüan 387; SYHA, chüan 46, pp. 1a-3b (I, pp. 695-96); 25, p. 35b (I, p. 478); 34, p. 21a (I, p. 572); 36, p. 15a (I, p. 597); 40, p. 23b (I, p. 636); 44, p. 8b (I, p. 679); SYHAPI, chüan 46, p. 2b; 30, p. 34b; 44, p. 20b; 99, p. 117.

2. SYHA, chüan 40, p. 23b (I, p. 636).

3. Ibid., chüan 34, p. 21a (I, p. 572) and 46, p. 1a (I, p. 695).

4. Ibid., chüan 36, p. 15a (I, p. 597) and 46, p. 1a (I, p. 675).

5. Ibid., chüan 25, p. 35b (I, p. 478).

6. For biographical information on Yü Shu, see ibid., chüan 25, p. 25a (I, p. 473).

7. Biographical information in SS, chüan 363; SYHA, chüan 20, pp. 14b-16a (I, pp. 411-12); SYHAPI, chüan 20, pp. 8b-11a; 5, p. 38b.

8. SYHA, chüan 20, p. 14b (I, p. 411).

9. Biographical information in SS, chüan 445; SYHAPI, chüan 6, p. 112b.

10. SYHAPI, chüan 25, p. 9a. For biographical information on Hsü Fu, see SYHA, chüan 25, pp. 26a-b (I, p. 473).

Finally, Chang Chün 張浚,[1] the famous prime minister who wrote many works of scholarship, studied under a Ch'eng disciple, Ch'iao Ting 譙定.[2] In the Sung-Yüan hsüeh-an p'u-i, chuan 44, the comment is made that Chang Chün studied under a disciple of the Ch'eng brothers, but their influence on his scholarship was not great. Nonetheless, the flourishing of the Ch'eng school in the early Southern Sung was due to his activities.[3]

Thus among the 22 laymen, we find one who studied under the Ch'eng brothers directly, six who studied under one or more of the Ch'eng brothers' most prominent students, and two who studied with students of students of the Ch'engs. Two more are identified with the Ch'eng school in an unspecified manner. Two more who did not study with the teachers in the Ch'eng line studied with Liu An-shih, a disciple of Ssu-ma Kuang. Thus well over half of the laymen for whom we have any information at all were inheritors of the Tao-hsüeh teaching.[4]

---

1. Biographical information in SS, chüan 361; SYHA, chüan 44, p. 3b; 30, p. 12b; 40, p. 10b; 99, p. 23a; SYHAPI, chüan 44, p. 10a; 2, p. 90a.

2. SYHAPI, chüan 44, p. 10a-b.

3. SYHAPI, chüan 44, p. 10a-b. Winston Wan Lo says: "The men who played leading roles in the founding of the Southern Sung regime in Hangchow were also on the whole well disposed to Ch'eng I. The most notable were Chang Chün (1097-1164) and Chao Ting (1085-1147). The latter, in his capacity as Prime Minister, was particularly known to have favored the students of Ch'eng I, so that men looking for official appointments would falsely claim to be the latter's students to augment their chance of success" (Lo, pp. 34-35).

4. Other close lay acquaintances and students of Ta-hui for whom no letters are included in the Ta-hui shu also have biographies in the SS, SYHA or SYHAPI. Two of these were Feng Chung-shu 馮忠恕, SYHA, chüan 27, pp. 9b-10a (I, p. 491), a disciple of Yin Tun and thus a second-generation follower of Ch'eng I; and Li P'eng 李彭 (T. Shang-lao

C. Tao-hsüeh and the Ch'an of Ta-hui: Similarities and Differences

The connection between Ta-hui and a remarkable number of Neo-Confucian scholars of the Ch'eng brothers' school raises a number of interesting questions that fall into four categories. First, what were the teachings of the Ch'eng brothers' school of Tao-hsüeh, and how were they similar to and different from the Ch'an Buddhism that Ta-hui was teaching? What in the one would appeal to students of the other? Second, what were the unresolved issues in the Tao-hsüeh of the Ch'eng brothers with which their disciples and followers were wrestling? Third, was Ta-hui aware of, and if so, sympathetic to or antagonistic toward the teachings of Tao-hsüeh? Did his teaching reflect the influence of Tao-hsüeh? Did he attempt to contribute to the discussion of its as yet unresolved issues? Fourth, what were the attitudes of Tao-hsüeh scholars, particularly those who studied with Ta-hui, toward Buddhist teaching and practice, and toward Ch'an in particular? To what extent did Ta-hui teach his Confucian students, and did those students espouse, the view that Confucian teaching and practice and Buddhist teaching and practice were essentially similar?

Exhaustive answers cannot be given to these questions on the basis of the author's studies so far, depending as they do on a vastly more extensive study of the writings of Ta-hui's Confucian disciples and their

---

商老), SYHAPI, chüan 19, p. 69b. Another with whom Ta-hui and Chang Chiu-ch'eng had discussions of Tao-hsüeh ideas (particularly ko-wu 格物) was Feng Chi 馮檝 (T. Chi-ch'uan 濟川), (d. 1150), a Dharma-heir of Ta-hui. There is no biography of him in any of these three works, although there are others elsewhere.

Confucian teachers than has been undertaken as yet by anyone. But perhaps some general directions can be outlined and some suggestive evidence presented in this chapter and the next. The fourth group of questions will be addressed in Chapter III; in this chapter we will address the first three groups of questions directly or obliquely.

The Ch'eng brothers were interested in explaining the essential unity of all things, the Tao, the one in the many, which creates, forms and unites all things at the same time that it gives them individuality.[1] The point of such an enterprise was to show how one could become a sage, that is, a man who, being united with this one Tao in his own being, would be able to understand and act in accord with the Tao in all affairs. A sage was one whose mind could respond to external things naturally in a good way, nourishing and sustaining and governing them in such a way as to continue the creative activity of the Tao. Whereas other Sung Confucians such as Chang Tsai and Chou Tun-i 周敦頤 used metaphors borrowed from Taoism or the I Ching to name this universal Tao, the Ch'eng brothers called it "Principle." Rather than employing the monistic metaphor of "the source" to describe its relations to all things, they employed a metaphor, "Principle" (Li 理), which was on one level dualistic. Like the grain in wood, it was the Principle that

---

1. This account is based largely on the writings and translations of Wing-tsit Chan, Source Book; Chu Hsi and Lü Tzu-ch'ien, eds., (Wing-tsit Chan, trans.), Reflections on Things at Hand (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967); A. C. Graham, Two Chinese Philosophers; Fung Yu-lan, History of Chinese Philosophy, II; T. A. Metzger, Escape From Predicament; and Carsun Chang, The Development of Neo-Confucian Thought, I.

provided the pattern of a thing, yet the Principle was distinguishable from the Ch'i 氣) material force, ether) which it informed. All things had their principles, but the many principles, said Ch'eng I, were in fact one Principle.

In man, Principle was called the Nature; the Nature was, accordingly, good. Man's True Mind (Tao-hsin 道心) was identical with Principle, and thus had innately within it the principles of all things. The knowing of principles differed from the knowing of facts: as Ch'eng I said:

> Knowledge derived from the senses is not the knowledge derived from the Moral Nature. When the body makes contact with things knowledge of them is not from within. This is all that is meant nowadays by "wide information and much ability." The knowledge which comes from the Moral Nature does not depend on seeing and hearing.[1]

The "material force" (Ch'i), however, might be either good or bad, that is, more or less opaque to Principle. In the state of equilibrium (chung 中) one's mind and actions would naturally accord with Principle; if, in the issuance of emotions, one lost one's inner equilibrium, one would find this insight into Principle clouded by opaque material force, and one would cease to act according to Principle. One would then be guided by one's human mind rather than one's True Mind. One could return to insight into Principle not through a direct introspection---for even though Principle is complete in us, the opaque Ch'i prevents us from

1. Chu Hsi, ed., Honan Ch'eng-shih i-shu, Kuo-hsüeh chi-pen ts'ung-shu (Basic Sinological Series) edition (Shanghai: Shang-wu yin-shu-kuan, 1935), chüan 25, p. 348, line 11, quoted in Graham, p. 15.

seeing clearly if we look inside ourselves---but through "the investigation of things," that is, of the principles in things and affairs external to ourselves. After investigation of a sufficient number of apparently discrete principles, Principle itself in our own minds becomes clear. Such an achievement is the realization of sincerity (ch'eng 誠), the inner integrity that comes from being one with Principle in ourselves and all things. It is important while investigating things that one maintain an attitude of "seriousness" (ching 敬, also translated "attention" and "reverence", and by Graham, "composure"), for this is the attitude that unites the mind with Principle in its object, and excludes the selfish emotions of the Ch'i.

The points in this account which remained at issue among the contemporaries of the Ch'engs and among their followers were the assertion that the Nature is equal to Principle and is good,[1] the assertion that the True Mind is equivalent to Nature and Principle,[2] and the assertion that to gain insight into Principle already complete in one's mind, one has to investigate principles in external things and affairs.[3]

---

1. Cf. Graham, pp. 46-47 for a discussion of the degree to which the goodness, neutrality or badness of the Nature was a disputed subject at the time Ch'eng Hao and Ch'eng I declared that Mencius was correct in saying that it was good. Han Yü, Ssu-ma Kuang, Su Shih, Wang An-shih, Li Kou, Ou-yang Hsiu, Chou Tun-i, Chang Tsai, and Hsieh Liang-tso, for example, all had other views.

2. Graham, pp. 62-66. Chu Hsi did not follow the Ch'engs in identifying the mind with the principles themselves. "True Mind" translates "Tao-hsin."

3. Cf. Graham, pp. 75-76.

There is no question but that from the point of view of scholar-officials, the Tao-hsüeh movement of the Ch'eng brothers and the Ch'an movement had much in common. Those who were drawn to the Tao-hsüeh teaching tended also to be drawn to Ch'an, for both offered a path to an experiential understanding of the unity of all things and to the realization of a mind that could respond effortlessly to affairs while remaining essentially unattached and unmoved. Both identified man's central problem as the distortion introduced by selfish emotions obstructing realization of the substance and activity of True Mind or Nature. Both offered a complete account of the origin and nature of men and things, that is, a metaphysics, a cosmogony, an epistemology and a psychological anthropology. Both located in the mind the origin of evil, and also taught that through the mind one could overcome evil and realize the inherently good Nature. Both saw true knowledge as inherent and distinct from knowledge of fact and of sense objects. Study, then, became not a matter of accumulation of information or a scholarly grasp of detail, but a process by which insight transformed one's fundamental character.

There were also real differences, either of essence or of emphasis, between the two teachings. One, of course, was of vocabulary. At a time when Ch'an was moving into the mainstream of the Chinese Buddhist tradition and incorporating more and more terms, concepts, illustrations and ritual from Buddhist sūtras and traditional forms of piety,[1] the

---

1. A change which can be seen very clearly if one compares the Recorded Sayings of Ta-hui with those of his predecessor Lin-chi, for example.

Neo-Confucians were consciously and deliberately revitalizing and re-interpreting the traditional texts, vocabulary and historical illustrations of the Confucian tradition.

From the Tao-hsüeh point of view, it seemed that Tao-hsüeh Confucians valued action in a world which Buddhists supposed to be illusion: the fact that Confucians sought to explicate Principle as it appeared in human affairs, while Buddhists did not, seemed evidence of this. Confucians felt that they differed from Buddhists in stressing the reality of everything, and in creating a theoretical framework which allowed things to be conceived of as real. Although both groups saw dealing with specifics as secondary to insight and personal change, the Ch'eng brothers' understanding of the process of self-cultivation through the investigation of things (concrete examples) incidently brought the learning of fact and the handling of practical affairs into the process of achieving sagehood, whereas the Ch'an understanding of the process did not. Yet another difference was the departure by Ch'eng I from the monistic "source" metaphor to describe the relation between the Tao and phenomena, and the adoption of the apparently dualistic metaphor of Li and Ch'i. In the early Southern Sung, however, Tao-hsüeh scholars also studied the writings of Chou Tun-i on the Wu-chi-erh-t'ai-chi 無極而太極,[1] and tried to use this metaphor

1. Chou Tun-i's most famous works were the T'ai-chi t'u 太極圖 (Supreme Ultimate Chart) and the T'ung shu 通書 (Penetrating the Book of Changes). In the former he names the Wu-chi-erh-t'ai-chi as the source of all things. Cf. Graham, p. xviii, who notes that Li T'ung 李通, who studied under Lo Ts'ung-yen, identified the Supreme Ultimate with Principle. See also Graham, pp. 152-75, where he discusses the relation of Chou Tun-i to the Ch'eng brothers. He points out that

o ground Ch'eng I's dualism in an ultimate monism, so that this dif-erence from the non-dualism of Ch'an became less important.[1] Likewise he different understanding of practice implied in Ch'eng I's interpre-:ation of "investigation of things" was an unsettled issue. There were :hose who identified themselves as followers of the Ch'eng brothers vho yet held that it was possible to grasp Principle in one's Nature lirectly through introspection and insight.

The apparent fundamental similarities between Tao-hsüeh and Ch'an nade the issue of whether one could be interested in Buddhism, or even practice Ch'an, while pursuing one's studies of Confucian teaching as interpreted by the Ch'eng brothers a frequently discussed and debated question.[2] A lot depended on whether one felt that similarities were more important than the differences, or vice versa. Ch'eng I himself felt strongly that Buddhism was a dangerous enemy, and urged his fol-lowers to stay completely away from it. In a famous passage he said:

> This doctrine has already become a fashion through-out the Empire; how can the situation be remedied? Buddhism already existed in ancient times, but even when it was most prosperous it only preached image-worship, and the harm it did was very slight. But its present tendency is to speak first of all of the Nature and the Decree, the Way and the Virtue, to pursue first of all the intelligent; and it is those

---

not only were the Ch'eng brothers' own ideas not influenced by that of Chou Tun-i, neither also were those of their immediate disciples.

1. Cf. Graham, p. 166, where he states: "There is no doubt that the circulation of the Supreme Ultimate Chart and the T'ung Shu in the twelfth century originated in the Ch'eng school."

2. See Chapter III below.

> of the loftiest talents who sink most deeply into it. As for me, I am a person with mediocre talent and virtue, and am incapable of dealing with it; but as things are going today, even if there were several men each as great as Mencius, they would be helpless. Consider the time of Mencius; the harm done by Yang [Chu] 楊朱 and Mo[-tzu] 墨子 did not amount to much, and compared with the situation today it was negligible. And of course the matter is connected with the failure or success [of the state]. When the "pure talkers" flourished, the Chin dynasty decayed; but the harm done by them was limited to idle talk, and was in no way comparable with the present injury to the Way. Even when a friend sinks into this doctrine one cannot turn him back; now my only hope is in you gentlemen. You must simply put it aside without discussing it; do not say, "We must see what it is like," for if you see what it is like you will yourselves be changed into Buddhists. The essential thing is decisively to reject its arts.[1]

Many of Ch'eng I's followers, however, were attracted to Ch'an and were more impressed by similarities than by differences. (This is a topic to which we will return in Chapter III.)

Ta-hui's teachings and attitudes share many characteristic emphases with those of the Sung Confucian Tao-hsüeh movement. There is in fact so much general similarity between the two that the two can be seen as strands within a single cultural-religious fabric. All of the points of similarity between Ch'an and Confucian Tao-hsüeh mentioned above apply with equal force to Ta-hui's Ch'an teaching. In addition, we should also call attention to Ta-hui's Ch'an emphasis on the understanding

---

1. Honan Ch'eng-shih i-shu, Kuo-hsüeh chi-pen ts'ung-shu edition, chüan 2a, p. 24, lines 1-6, translated by Graham, p. 83. Other criticisms of Buddhism by the Ch'eng brothers can be found in Chan, Source Book, pp. 533, 535, 542, 554-55, 564-65, and in many other works. I have made some changes in Graham's translation of this passage.

of the Tao as being passed from the mind of one who understands it to the mind of another who comes to understand it in an unbroken chain of transmission, rather than by intellectual grasp of doctrine formulated in written form;[1] his insistence that enlightenment or sagehood is an extraordinary goal that must be sought in a special way, not merely by carrying out one's social duties;[2] his emphasis on the One Mind as both identical with the Nature and the means by which the Nature can be seen;[3] his strong and frequently voiced conviction that the conventional approach to learning the classics and history for examination success and informational mastery is useless (he definitely shared Ch'eng I's view that learning that is not sought within one's self does not lead to understanding the Way [see Chapter VI below]). In addition, Ta-hui had a sense of mission similar in many ways to that of the Tao-hsüeh school: lacking any faith in institutional reform, he believed strongly with Ssu-ma Kuang and the Ch'eng brothers that if attitudes can be changed and the Way can be truly entered and mastered, the result will be a transformed world.[4]

Another point of similarity is that between Ta-hui's pedagogical approach and that of the Tao-hsüeh scholars. As did the Tao-hsüeh teachers, Ta-hui placed a great emphasis on practicing the way in one's daily situation in order to cultivate a deepened personal understanding

---

1. See Chapter VII below.

2. See Chapter VI below.

3. P'u Shuo, p. 461b.

4. See Chapter IV and Chapter VII below.

of it.[1] Likewise the Tao-hsüeh scholars used one-to-one teaching methods not dissimilar to Ta-hui's Ch'an use of the hua-t'ou and personal interviews. Most significant, however, is the common interest in opening up the teaching to everyone who cared to learn. Tao-hsüeh was developed and taught in contexts which opened up discussion of the Way to all interested persons. Ta-hui's desire to teach the highest Ch'an teaching to laity as well as monks, to casual listeners as well as serious students, shows a similar commitment to open styles of pedagogy.[2]

D. Evidence of Ta-hui's Response to Tao-hsüeh

As will be discussed in the next chapter, Ta-hui, perhaps due to these broad areas of similarity, had a very positive attitude toward Confucian teaching in general. There are passages, though, that indicate that he was aware of and addressed himself at times specifically to teachings that were particularly emphasized in the Tao-hsüeh movement, and to issues then currently being debated.[3] For example, he showed that he understood both the goal and the process of Tao-hsüeh:

> If when scholars and superior men study the Way of the former kings [i.e., the Confucian Way] they have no moment of activation of insight, then they aren't able to reach the limit of Principle and exhaust the Nature.[4]

---

1. See Chapter VIII below.

2. See Chapter V below.

3. That Ta-hui was aware of the Tao-hsüeh movement is indicated by a reference in P'u Shuo, p. 472a, to hsing-ming-chih-hsüeh 性命之學, a term that referred to Tao-hsüeh in particular.

4. P'u Shuo, p. 453a. Cf. Chang Tsai's statement that "It is only after exhausting the principles that one can fulfill one's own Nature" (Honan Ch'eng-shih i-shu, Kuo-hsüeh chi-pen ts'ung-shu edition, p. 126, line 11f,

In another passage Ta-hui discusses at length the issue of the goodness of the Nature, a subject on which there was much difference of opinion among Sung Confucians:

> Doing things lacking in truth is opposing the Nature. Doing things correctly is following the Nature. Opposing or following depends on the person, not on the Nature. Benevolence, righteousness, propriety, wisdom and trustworthiness depend on the Nature, not on the person. There are wise and stupid persons, but not wise and stupid Natures. If benevolence, righteousness, propriety, wisdom and trustworthiness belonged to the wise and not to the stupid, then the Way of the sages would be discriminatory. It would be like saying that when Heaven gives rain, it first chooses the spot. Therefore I say that benevolence, righteousness, propriety, wisdom and trustworthiness depend on the Nature, not on the person. Whether one is wise or stupid, follows or opposes, depends on the person, not on the Nature.[1] Yang Hsiung talks about "cultivating

---

translated by Graham, p. 10). The Ch'eng brothers saw the two as simultaneous. Ch'eng I says: "The investigation of Principle to the utmost, the full development of the Nature, and the fulfillment of Destiny are only one thing. As Principle is investigated to the utmost, one's Nature is fully developed, and as one's Nature is fully developed, Destiny is fulfilled" (Honan Ch'eng-shih i-shu, Ssu-pu-pei-yao edition, chüan 18, p. 9a, translated by Wing-tsit Chan in Source Book, p. 563. I have used Chan's translation, but capitalized "Nature," "Principle" and "Destiny"). The classical source for this idea is a line in the Shuo-kua 說卦 (Explanation of the Diagrams), one of the appendices of the I Ching: "They [the sages] exhausted the principles, fulfilled the Nature, and thereby attained to the Decree" (T'ao Tsung-han, ed., I-ching chi-chu [Taipei: Hsin-lu Shu-chü, 1968], p. 115; I have used Graham's translation, p. 74).

1. Cf. Ch'eng I's similar statements on this subject:

> "Mencius was correct in saying that man's Nature is good. Even Hsun Tzu and Yang Hsiung failed to understand man's Nature. Mencius was superior to other Confucians because he understood man's Nature. There is no Nature that is not good. Evil is due to capacity. Man's Nature is the same as Principle, and Principle is the same from the sage-emperors Yao

> The Nature," but the Nature can't be cultivated; only following, opposing, wisdom and stupidity, can be cultivated....If you know the place where benevolence, righteousness, propriety, wisdom and trustworthiness arise in the Nature, then "examining things," "loyalty and reciprocity," "one common thread," all are within it. Therefore I say that "study" and "the Way" are one.[1]

This passage is clearly a comment on one of the passages in the writings of early Confucians the interpretation of which was most central

---

> and Shun to the common man in the street. Capacity is an endowment from material force. Material force may be clear or turbid. Men endowed with clear material force are wise, while those endowed with turbid material force are stupid. Further question: Can stupidity be changed? Answer: Yes" (Honan Ch'eng-shih i-shu, Ssu-pu-pei-yao edition, chüan 18, p. 17b, translated in Chan, Source Book, p. 567; I have used Chan's translation with minor changes).

Again:

> Nature comes from Heaven, whereas capacity comes from material force. When material force is clear, capacity is clear. When material force is turbid, capacity is turbid....Capacity may be good or evil, but the Nature is always good" (Honan Ch'eng-shih i-shu, Ssu-pu-pei-yao edition, chüan 19, p. 4b, translated in Chan, Source Book, p. 569; I have used Chan's translation with minor changes).

Ta-hui's and Ch'eng I's philosophical metaphors are, of course, not identical, but the structure of thought on this question is suggestively similar.

1. Letters, p. 149. Yang Hsiung's position was that the Nature is a mixture of good and bad, either of which can be developed. Cf. Graham, p. 45. I have translated "hsien 賢" as "wise" in this passage as Ch'an has done in the Ch'eng I passage in order to bring out the parallel between the two.

most controversial to Tao-hsüeh scholars. This passage is the opening :ences of the Doctrine of the Mean:

> The Decree of Heaven is what is meant by the Nature.
> To follow the Nature is what is meant by the Way.
> To cultivate the Way is what is meant by education.[1]

:s not clear from Ta-hui's statement whether he supports the position :n by Ch'eng I that the Nature is good, or whether he supports a ;htly different position, apparently held by Chang Tsai, Ch'eng Hao others, that "to do good is in accordance with the Nature, to do l goes against it; but the Nature itself cannot be called good."[2] distinction rests on the view of some thinkers that "good" derives meaning in contradistinction to "evil," and thus could be used for ıgs and activities, but not for the one Way, or for the Nature, which prior to and beyond the distinction between good and evil. It is ır, however, that Ta-hui does not intend to imply in this statement t evil is real and comes from the Nature also, as Ch'eng Hao and ɜr Confucians had been forced to conclude, or that the Nature is a ture of good and evil and must therefore be altered through self-tivation, as Yang Hsiung had held. What comes from the Nature ntaneously is only good; one can change oneself so as to accord with Nature, but one cannot change the Nature.

Ta-hui's conclusion, that "study" and "the Way" are one, seems eed, as he suggests, to follow logically either from the premise that

---

Hsieh Ping-ying, et al., eds. Hsin-i ssu-shu tu-pen (Taipei: San-Shu-chü, 1966), p. 17. This translation is my own. Wing-tsit n's translation (Source Book, p. 98) is very similar in interpretation, not in wording.

Graham, p. 45.

the Nature is good, or from the premise that the Nature cannot be described as "good," but that obeying it is good. In either case "to cultivate the Way" in the Doctrine of the Mean passage cannot mean "to cultivate the Nature," or to change the Nature by self-cultivation, because the Nature is already good or is a perfect source of goodness. Thus the last two sentences of the passage must be identical in meaning: "study" must be equivalent to "the Way", which is following, obeying, being in accord with, the Nature.

In Chang Chiu-ch'eng's Records of the Transmission of Mind (Hsin ch'uan lu 心傳錄), Chang quotes his teacher Ta-hui as saying of the same passage in the Doctrine of the Mean that the essential terms in its three sentences, Nature, Two and study, have the same relation to each other as three different bodies of the Buddha (Trikāya): Nature in the first sentence is equal to the pure Dharmakāya, the same body of the Law or Truth; the following of the Nature which is called the Way is equal to Sambhogakāya, the Body of Enjoyment; and study, or teaching, in the third sentence, is equal to the billions of bodies (Nirmanakāya) into which the Buddha transforms himself to teach sentient beings.[1] Thus the three terms in the Doctrine of the Mean represent the same active truth seen from different points of view or in terms of its different functions. The first is the Nature as absolute; the second, the Way, is the Nature manifesting itself in perfect form in everything

---

1. Quoted by Huang Chen in SYHA, chüan 40, pp. 15b-16a (I, p. 632), in Chang Chiu-ch'eng's biography.

that is in accord with it; and the third, study or teaching, is the Nature in the process of enlightening beings; or, seen from the point of view of the being, it is beings experiencing the realization of the Nature.

Ta-hui develops this point that in Confucian teaching "study" and "the Way" are one at some length in two other passages:

> The Dharmas of the sages of the Three Teachings---there isn't one that doesn't urge the good and forbid the bad, and rectify men's minds (hsin-shu 心術). If one's mind is not rectified, then one will be licentious and immoral, and profit will be one's only object. If one's mind is rectified, then one will be loyal and righteous, and follow only Principle.... The point of a broad education is only to learn what kind of mental effort the sage makes. If you learn that, then your mind will be rectified. If your mind is rectified, then all varieties of poison and all kinds of heretical teachings won't be able to stain it. [One who] resolves to study Confucianism must, [as Mencius said,] "extend and complete it, and then apply it by extension to [external] things." Why? Because study that doesn't achieve its goal isn't study [i.e., realization of the Nature]. Study that has achieved its goal but can't be applied isn't study. Study that isn't able to transform things isn't study. If your study is really thorough and reaches its goal, then literary skill and military skill and phenomena and principles will all be mastered as a consequence.[1]

> Carrying out your study and carrying out the Way are one. When one carries out study, it is because one has not yet reached sagehood, but one expects to reach it. When one carries out the Way, one puts one's mind into things and onself. When things and oneself are one, then the Way and study are both complete. When shih-tai-fu read many books, it is not only in order to cultivate themselves in order to seek wealth, status and happiness. "Study" and "the Way" are both

---

1. Yü-lu, Taishō 47, pp. 912c-13a.

> to be extended and completed, and then applied by extension to external things....You must know that in Confucian teaching, the first and most important thing is to rectify one's mind. When one's mind is rectified, then suddenly "even in moments of haste and confusion" one does nothing that does not fit perfectly with this Tao. This is what I mean by saying that study and carrying out the Way are one.[1]

From this it would follow that there is no effective "investigation ıto (the principles) of things" that is not at the same time a realiza- ion of the spontaneous, perfect activity of the Nature. No matter how ne goes about rectifying the mind, it is clear that a rectified mind nd an insight into the Nature are logically prior to and identical ith "study" or that "Way" which is following the Nature. Perhaps hat Ta-hui wishes to say is that the debate about whether one investi- ates things first in order to gain an insight into that Principle which s one's Nature, or whether one can proceed to such insight directly hrough introspection is a false issue, since in either case exactly he same rectification of mind is taking place, exactly the same Nature s becoming manifest in one's mind.

Elsewhere it is recorded that in a famous interview with Chang hiu-ch'eng, in which the latter asked him about "the investigation of hings (ko-wu 格物)," Ta-hui replied, "You know about 'ko-wu', but

---

. Yü-lu, Taishō 47, p. 913a-b. Ta-hui has tsao-tz'u tien-p'ei 造次顛沛, an abbreviated quotation from the Analects, Chapter IV, no. 5, here we find: "Chün-tzu wu chung shih chih chien wei jen, tsao tz'u i yü shih, tien p'ei pi yü shih 君子無終食之間違仁，造次必於是顛沛必於是 (Hsieh Ping-ying, et al., eds., Isin-i ssu-shu tu-pen [Taipei: San-min Shu-chü, 1966], pp. 79-80). han translates this as: "A superior man never abandons humanity even or the lapse of a single meal. In moments of haste, he acts according o it; in times of difficulty or confusion, he acts according to it" Source Book, p. 26).

you don't know about 'wu-ko'."[1] This might be interpreted as saying that Chang is hindered by his attachment to the subject-object distinction implied in ko-wu, "investigating things." Turning it around to "things investigating" is a way of suggesting the one-sidedness of the distinction, and perhaps too that one need not pass through the stage of finding Principal outside one's Nature in order to recognize it in one's Nature.

These few passages, taken together with his frequent laudatory references to the Mencius and the Analects of Confucius (see Chapter III below), suggest that Ta-hui attracted scholar-official friends and disciples particularly from among the students and followers of the Ch'eng brothers and Ssu-ma Kuang partly because he was aware of, interested in, and sympathetic toward the Tao-hsüeh movement and its attempt to relate the texts of the classics to personal experience; and even that, always from his Ch'an point of view, he was willing to offer his own opinion on problems he saw his Confucian disciples confronting as they tried to think about the Tao, problems that were still controversial in the Tao-hsueh school. No doubt he was most concerned about these problems because they might block a student's progress on the path to enlightenment, but he also appears to have been concerned that students properly understand the Confucian Way as well. The fact that he had an appreciative audience for his interpretations suggests the closeness of certain aspects of the understanding of Tao and sagehood by this generation of Tao-hsüeh followers to the Ch'an understanding of Tao and Buddhahood.

---

1. Wu-teng hui-yüan, chüan 20, Zokuzōkyō, 2, 11, 4, p. 402b.

Ta-hui's alleged influence upon the Tao-hsüeh movement, particularly through his student and Dharma-heir Chang Chiu-ch'eng, was much deplored by later Confucian scholars. In the thirteenth century, Huang Chen wrote:

> When Hsieh Liang-tso (a student and follower of the Ch'eng brothers) talked about Ch'an, he talked straight-forwardedly and people who heard him knew that it was Ch'an. But since the monk Tsung-kao (Ta-hui) advised Chang Chiu-ch'eng to make some superficial changes in Ch'an words and talk Ch'an in a Confucian context, there have been scholars who are brazen enough to deny categorically that there is Ch'an in their teachings.[1]

Chu Hsi also said that the damage that Chang's Records of the Transmission of Mind had done to orthodox Confucianism (through its interpreting Confucian teachings and texts in a Ch'an fashion) was like the destructive effects upon human life of beasts, barbarians and the Great Flood.[2] Whether Ta-hui's teaching did influence the Tao-hsüeh movement through disciples like Lü Pen-chung and Chang Chiu-ch'eng, and if so, how, remain subjects for further study. Certainly Ta-hui need not have had devious or sinister purposes in exploring with Chang Chiu-ch'eng the similarities between the two teachings. There can be no doubt, however, that Ta-hui helped to establish within Sung Buddhism a climate favorable to Tao-hsüeh, with important results such as the transmission of Tao-hsüeh Confucian texts and teachings to Japan by Japanese Zen monks who had studied in China, and the active interest in Tao-hsüeh taken by Japanese Zen monks.

---

1. SYHA, chüan 40, p. 16a (I, p. 632), quoted in Liu Ts'un-yüan, p. 28.

2. Quoted by Huang Chen as recorded in SYHA, chüan 40, p. 16a (I, p. 632).

TABLE II

Ta-hui's Students and Tao-hsüeh

NAME	SCHOLARLY LINEAGES	CONNECTION WITH CH'ENG BROTHERS AND/OR SSU-MA KUANG
1. Tseng K'ai 曾開	Student of Yu Tso.	Second generation direct line of Ch'engs.
2. Li Ping[1] 李邴		
3. Fu Chih-jou[2] 富直柔	Grandson of Fu Pi 富弼.	
4. Liu Tzu-yü[3] 劉子羽	Brother of Liu Tzu-hui.	
5. Liu Tzu-hui 劉子翬	Follower of Ch'eng brothers.	Follower of Ch'engs.
6. Chang Chün 張浚	Student of Ch'iao Ting.	Second generation disciple of Ch'engs.
7. Chang Kao[4] 張杲	Disciple of Ch'eng I.	Disciple of Ch'eng I.

1. Biographical information in SS, chüan 375; and SYHAPI, chüan 1, p. 74a.

2. Biographical information in SS, chüan 375; and SYHAPI, chüan 3, p. 177b.

3. Biographical information in SS, chüan 370; SYHAPI, chüan 1, p. 83a.

4. Biographical information in SYHAPI, chüan 30, p. 32a-b.

TABLE II CONTINUED

NAME		SCHOLARLY LINEAGES	CONNECTION WITH CH'ENG BROTHERS AND/OR SSU-MA KUANG
8.	Wang Tsao[1] 汪藻	Disciple of Hsü Fu, Chiang Wei 江緯,[2] Chang Wu-yuan 張吳園,[3] and Yang Shih.	Third generation disciple of Ch'engs through Hsü Fu and Yang Shih.
9.	Lü Pen-chung 呂本中	Disciple of Liu An-shih, Yang Shih, and other Ch'eng disciples.	Second generation disciple of Ssu-ma Kuang. Second generation disciple of Ch'eng brothers.
10.	Wang Ying-Ch'en 汪應辰	Disciple of Hu An-kuo, Lü Pen-chung, Chang Chiu-ch'eng, and Yu Shu.	Multiple second and third generation disciple of Ch'eng brothers.
11.	Li Kuang 李光	Disciple of Liu An-shih.	Second generation disciple through Liu An-shih of Ssu-ma Kuang.
12.	Tseng T'ien 曾恬	Disciple of Hsieh Liang-tso, Liu An-shih, Yang Shih, Ch'en Kuan and Liao Weng.	Second generation disciple of Ssu-ma Kuang. Multiple second generation connections to Ch'eng brothers.
13.	Liu Ts'en[4] 劉岑	Relative of Liu Mu 劉牧.	

1. Biographical information in SS, chüan, 445; SYHAPI, chüan 6, p. 112b; 25, p. 78a; 25, p. 90a; 35, p. 50b; 98, p. 155b; 98, p. 159b.

2. Biographical information in SYHAPI, chüan 6, p. 94b.

3. Biographical information in SS, chüan 356; SYHAPI, chüan 25, p. 27b.

4. Biographical information in SYHAPI, chüan 3, p. 198a.

TABLE II CONTINUED

NAME	SCHOLARLY LINEAGES	CONNECTION WITH CH'ENG BROTHERS AND/OR SSU-MA KUANG
14. Li Mi-cheng[1] 李彌正	Son of Li Hsuan 李撲.	
15. Li Mo[2] 李謨		
16. Hsiang Tzu-yin 向子諲	Disciple of Liu An-shih.	Second generation disciple of Ssu-ma Kuang. Friend of Hu An-kuo.
17. Yang Ju-nan 楊汝南	Disciple of Ch'eng I	Disciple of Ch'eng I.
18. Lou Chao[3] 樓炤	Disciple of Ch'uan Pang-yen 權邦彥.	
19. Chang Hsiao-hsiang[4] 張孝祥	Son of Chang Chi 張祁.	
20. Fan Kuang-yüan 樊光遠	Disciple of Chang Chiu-ch'eng.	Third generation disciple of Ch'engs through Chang Chiu-ch'eng.
21. Chang Chiu-Ch'eng 張九成	Student of Yang Shih	
22. T'ang Ssu-t'ui[5] 湯思退		

1. Biographical information in SYHA, chüan 4.

2. Biographical information in SYHAPI, chüan 6, p. 105b.

3. Biographical information in SS, chüan 380; SYHAPI, chüan 18, p. 113b; 96, p. 55b.

4. Biographical information in SS, chüan 389; SYHA, chüan 41; SYHAPI, chüan 41, p. 26b; 44, p. 22a.

5. Biographical information in SS, chüan 371.

Chapter III: Ta-Hui and Confucian Teachings: Three Teachings Return to One, Part I

In the last chapter we explored the relation between Ta-hui and the Tao-hsüeh movement, showing that many of Ta-hui's lay students belonged to that movement and that he himself made comments indicating that he was both aware of and friendly toward that school, perhaps even to the point of hoping to encourage in it a truer Confucian understanding of the Nature, the Tao and sagehood. In the present chapter we shall explore Ta-hui's belief that "the Three Teachings (i.e., Confucianism, Buddhism and Taoism) return to one,"[1] and suggest both that 1) Ta-hui's attitude represents a possibly more widespread shift, occurring in the late Northern and early Southern Sung, in Buddhist thinking on the question of the similarities and differences among the three traditions, and that 2) at least in the case of Ta-hui this shift may perhaps be traced in part to the changed character of Sung Confucianism, and in particular to the rise of the Tao-hsüeh school.

A. Early History of "Three Teachings Thought"

The Chinese have displayed throughout their history a strong tendency to believe that one cultural unit should have one state to govern it, and that the political unit should rest on an ideological unity--a clearly defined way of doing and thinking, fully understood and made

---

1. Ta-hui uses a variant of this phrase in his Yü-lu, Taishō 47, p. 906b, in which he states: "San-chiao sheng-jen li-chiao sui i, erh ch'i Tao t'ung-kuei i-chih 三教聖人立教雖異，而其道同歸一致 ("Although the sages of the three teachings established their teachings differently, their Ways all return to one point").

articulate by its educated elite but shared and paid allegiance by everyone. In part despite and in part because of this way of thinking, the Chinese learned to tolerate within their society a plurality of religious options and philosophical positions as well as a range of different ethical orientations. They called Buddhism, Taoism and Confucianism, the three streams of thought and practice that they recognized to be different philosophically, religiously and ethically, the "Three Teachings" (san-chiao 三教).

The degree of toleration that was achieved among the "Three Teachings," while by no means perfect or unbroken, was remarkable. More remarkable than this toleration was the fact that Chinese of all three groups developed the view that the teachings and even the practices of the three traditions were in essence one (san-chiao kuei-i 三教歸一). This belief was very significant, for it meant that an adherent of one of the "Three Teachings" felt that a person following the teaching and practice of either of the other two would not differ in ultimate intent from himself. Assuming aptitude, sincerity and diligence on the part of the follower, all of the three paths of practice and belief were thought to lead to the same or related insights and the same or related self-realization.

This idea was developed during a long history of conflict and accommodation.[1] It was first voiced in its complete form in the Sui dynasty in the sixth century, was expressed in different ways in the T'ang

---

1. A history of the relation between the "Three Teachings" has been attempted in book-length in Japanese by Tokiwa Daijō (Shina ni okeru Bukkyō to Jukyō Dōkyō [Tokyo: Tōhō bunko ronso 13, 1930], and by Kubota Ryōon (Shina Jo Dō Butsu sankyō shiron [Tokyo: Tōhō Shoin, 1931]).

nd Sung dynasties, became accepted widely by Buddhists, Confucians and aoists in the second half of the Sung period, and thereafter became a tandard assumption, very little challenged except by those who adhered o the more orthodox and exclusivistic schools of Confucianism. On the opular level this idea remains unchallenged even today as conventional isdom among religious Chinese of all persuasions.

The widespread acceptance and propagation of this idea among Southrn Sung monks made it one of the distinguishing characteristics of Sung uddhism and one of its chief legacies to Chinese Buddhism of the Yüan, ing and Ch'ing periods. Ta-hui holds a significant place in the istory of Ch'an Buddhism as one who did much to make the idea that the hree Teachings are in essence one an accepted axiom for Ch'an monks of the Lin-chi line. Among Ta-hui's Dharma-heirs and their students the otion that the "Three Teachings return to one" became very popular, and a-hui is given credit (or blame) for having been the source of its opularity.[1] He also, directly or through his disciples, contributed to its acceptance by Confucian scholar-officials.

The history of the concept that "the Three Teachings return to one" can be traced in treatises and other less formal writings back to the Sui dynasty Confucian, Wang T'ung 王通 (also known as Wen Chung-tzu 文中子 583-617).[2] But in fact the effort to show similarities between Buddhist and Taoist or Buddhist and Confucian teachings began

---

1. Cf. Kagamishima Genryū, Dōgen Zenji no inyō kyōten, goroku no kenkyū (Tokyo: Mokujisha, 1965), pp. 106-109.

2. Kamata Shigeo, "Zui Tō jidai ni okeru Ju Butsu Dō sankyō," Rekishi kyōiku, XVII, No. 3 (July, 1969), p. 26.

ith the introduction of Buddhism into China. Early Chinese Buddhists irst understood the teachings of this foreign tradition through its pparent similarities with Taoist metaphysics and cosmology, and then eliberately used parallels between Buddhist and Taoist terminology and eachings as a means by which to make Buddhist teachings intelligible to ther-educated Chinese for the purpose of its propagation. Soon, however, Chinese Buddhists realized that crucial differences between Taoist nd Buddhist thought and practice required Buddhists to translate or ransliterate Sanskrit terms into Chinese in order to have a vocabulary f technical terms which could not be confused with Taoist terms.[1] hereafter, throughout the six dynasties period, the differences between uddhist teachings and those of the indigenous Taoist and Confucian raditions received widespread attention, as Buddhists defended and xplained teachings such as karmic causality and transmigration, which ere clearly both alien to and opposed to the teachings of the Confu-ians and Taoists.[2] Whenever Taoists such as Ku Huan 顧歡 and hang Jung 張融 suggested that Buddhism was merely Taoism in a oreign guise, or that in fact it had been taught to Indian Buddhists y Lao-tzu, Buddhists defended the uniqueness and superiority of their eaching: to accept the view that Buddhism was the same as Taoism

---

. These sentences refer to the famous practice of ko-i 格義, about hich much has been written. Cf. for example Kenneth Ch'en, Buddhism n China (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964), pp. 68-69.

. Kubota, pp. 40-285. Cf. also E. Zürcher, The Buddhist Conquest of hina (Leyden: E. J. Brill & Co., 1959).

would be to acknowledge that the foreign version was unnecessary and inappropriate for China.[1]

In response to threats of persecution, Buddhists such as K'ang Seng-hui 康僧會 in the third century would argue in rare instances that the ethics and social norms implied by Buddhism and practiced by monks were essentially the same as those of Confucian teaching and culture, and thus should be welcomed by the state rather than suppressed.[2]

In the Sui and T'ang this argument was renewed and elaborated by Buddhists who repeatedly pointed out the essential correspondence between the Confucian "Five Constant Virtues" (wu-ch'ang 五常) and the five precepts which were to be kept by Buddhist laymen. For example, Shen Yüeh 沈約 argued in his Chün sheng lun 均聖論 that not only were killing, stealing, lying, intoxication and illicit sexual congress abjured by Buddhist laymen, but they were also prohibited by the teachings of Confucius and his followers as well.[3] Furthermore, said Yen Chih-t'ui 彥之推 in his Chia-hsun kuei hsin p'ien 家訓歸心篇, the virtue of jen 仁 is the same as the inner dimension of the practice of the precept of abstaining from killing; the virtue of righteousness (i 義) bears the same relation to abstaining from stealing; that of propriety (li 禮) to the practice of abstaining from illicit sexual congress; that of wisdom (chih 智), to the practice of abstaining from intoxication; and that of trustworthiness

---

1. Kubota, pp. 152-78

2. Kubota, pp. 31-40

3. Kubota, pp. 286-89. This work is found in the Kuang-hung-ming-chi, chüan 5.

ısin, 信), to the practice of not lying. But Buddhists always added ıat Confucian teaching and practice were not as thorough or as profound s those of the Buddhists.[1] It was a Confucian, Wang T'ung (583-617), ho proposed for the first time without qualification that although here are three teachings, and they are different, those who practice ne will reach the same goal as those who practice the other two.[2]

The outstanding T'ang dynasty contributor to the discussion of imilarities and differences among Confucian, Buddhist and Taoist raditions of thought was Ts'ung-mi 宗密 (780-841).[3] Ts'ung-mi's arly training was in classical Confucian studies preparatory to taking he civil service examinations; his familiarity with Confucian and 'aoist classics and their commentaries is revealed throughout his xtensive writings. In his late twenties he was converted to Ch'an and ecame a monk. In his early thirties he met the fourth patriarch of the lua-yen scholastic tradition, Ch'eng-kuan 澄觀, and embarked on the study of the Hua-yen systemization of Buddhist doctrine. He wrote on the history and teachings of the Ch'an schools known to him, wrote

---

1. Kubota, pp. 291-92. This correspondence was pointed out many times in T'ang and Sung discussions of the subject. Kenneth Ch'en also discusses the history of these correspondences (The Chinese Transformation of Buddhism [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973], pp. 48-60). Kao's work is found in the Kuang-hung-ming-chi, chuan 3. Cf. also Tokiwa, pp. 106-10.

2. Kamata, "Sui Tō jidai," p. 26. Tokiwa (pp. 111-14) and Kubota (pp. 295-98) also discuss Wang T'ung's opinions.

3. For Tsung-mi's biography, see Sung kao-seng chuan, chüan 6, Taishō 50, pp. 741c-743a and many other Buddhist collections. Kamata Shigeo, the foremost modern scholar of Ts'ung-mi's thought, provides a short biography in his Genjinron (Tokyo: Meitoku Shuppansha, 1974), pp. 21-25, and a longer treatment in his Shūmitsu kyōgaku no shisōshiteki kenkyū (Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1975), pp. 9-111.

long commentaries on the Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment (Yüan-chüeh ching 圓覺經) and other sūtras, and advocated combining Ch'an meditation with the study of the philosophical doctrines of the Hua-yen school. (This aspect of his thought will be discussed more fully in Chapter VI.)

Among Ts'ung-mi's most widely read and enduring works is a treatise called On the Original Nature of Man (Yüan-jen lun 原人論), a work which discusses the similarities and differences among the Confucian, Taoist and Buddhist teachings, particularly with respect to the adequacy of each in explaining the origin and fundamental nature of man.[1] In treating the Buddhist doctrines, Ts'ung-mi in this work distinguishes among and discusses five different kinds of Buddhist teachings on the subject. In the Yuan-jen lun, Ts'ung-mi makes the following statement about the truth of Confucianism and Taoism:

> Confucius, Lao-tzu and Śākya Buddha were perfect sages. They established their teachings according to the demands of the age and the needs of the various beings. They differ, therefore, in their approach. Buddhist and non-Buddhist teachings, however, complement each other: they benefit people, encourage them to perfect all good deeds, clarify the beginning and end of causal relationships, penetrate all phenomena (dharmas) and throw light on the relationship between root and branch by which all things come into being.[2]

---

1. The text of the Yüan-jen lun found in Taishō 45, pp. 707-710, has been translated into Japanese by Kamata Shigeo with extensive notes in his Genjinron and into English in W. T. de Bary, ed., The Buddhist Tradition in India, China and Japan (New York: Random House, Vintage Books edition, 1972), pp. 179-96. Translations in this chapter follow those in de Bary with minor changes.

2. Taishō 45, p. 708a; de Bary, p. 181. I have made minor changes in the translation.

Thus for Ts'ung-mi, the originators of the "Three Teachings" all merit the title of "sage"; their teachings, however, are understood under the Buddhist category of "upāya," that is, as adapted to the needs of beings and not necessarily as efforts to teach all beings the full truth, for which they may as yet be unprepared. Being the creation of sages, all of the "Three Teachings" benefit mankind and encourage good deeds.

Ts'ung-mi then proceeds to argue, however, that only Buddhist teachings, and in fact only the teachings of one school of Buddhism, enable one to understand the most profound truth about the origin of man. Ts'ung-mi says:

> Although the teachings reflect the intentions of the sages, differences exist in that there are real and provisional doctrines. Confucianism and Taoism are provisional doctrines; Buddhism consists of both real and provisional doctrines. In that they encourage the perfection of good deeds, punish wicked ones, and reward good ones, all three teachings lead to the creation of an orderly society; for this they must be observed with respect. In going to the root of things, Buddhism--since it examines all phenomena and, using every means, investigates their principles in an attempt to reveal their nature--decisively leads the other schools.[1]

The distinction between "provisional" and "real" teachings was one that had first been made in other doctrinal schools of Chinese Buddhism to address the problem posed by the fact that in the vast body of Indian Buddhist Mahāyāna sūtra literature flooding into China there appeared to be genuinely different and even contradictory or opposing teachings, yet all had the authority of attribution to Śākyamuni Buddha himself. How could the Buddha have been guilty of teaching apparently contradictory doctrines to his followers? One possible explanation was that

---

1. Taishō 45, p. 708a; de Bary, p. 181.

he taught doctrines of various degrees of completeness or profundity to his hearers according to their ability to understand, by stages leading them to ever more profound understanding until perfect understanding would be achieved. Teachings which were judged not to correspond to the ultimate or perfect level of understanding by the Chinese Buddhist scholars were called "provisional" (ch'üan 權) teachings; the most complete and profound teachings were called "real" (shih 實).[1] The Buddha could not teach an untrue teaching, but he could teach one that was less fully true than others.

Ts'ung-mi then moves on to show why it is that he regards Cunfucian and Taoist understandings of the original nature of man as merely provisional:

> In Confucianism and Taoism it is explained that all species--such as human beings, beasts, and others--are generated from and nourished by the Great Way of Nothingness. The principle of Tao gave rise spontaneously to the primal force (Ch'i, 氣), the primal force created Heaven and Earth, and Heaven and Earth produced the myriad creatures. The intelligent and the stupid, the high-born and the low-born, the rich and the poor, those who have ease and those who suffer--their lots are all bestowed by Heaven. They are dependent on time and destiny, and when death comes they return to Heaven and Earth, and revert to Nothing.[2]

Ts'ung-mi finds this explanation unconvincing and inadequate for several reasons. One reason is that intelligent life is thus said to

---

1. Cf. Junjiro Takakusu, The Essentials of Buddhist Philosophy, (3rd ed.; Honolulu: Office Appliance Co., Ltd., 1956), p. 117. "Ch'üan," here translated as "provisional," is also sometimes translated as "temporary," as Kamata does (Genjinron, p. 47).

2. Taishō 45, p. 708a; de Bary, p. 182.

originate from an unintelligent "primal force" (Ch'i), which is impossible; on the other hand, if Ch'i has consciousness, then so, by the theory, must earth and stones. Further, according to this account, the Great Way (Tao) is the basis of all wisdom and foolishness, good luck and bad luck; if that is so, how could anything be changed by human efforts? Moreover, if the Tao creates evil, how could it be good? On the other hand, spontaneous generation without laws of cause and effect denies any regularity. Beyond these problems, the theory gives no explanation for the fact that infants are born with personality, emotion and will, or for the fact that infants are not born with perfect virtue and understanding, but have to undergo education and training to perfect themselves. Most damaging, Ts'ung-mi feels, is the fact that the Confucian and Taoist theory shows Heaven to be unjust and unkind in causing so much suffering, and in causing the wicked to flourish and the good to die young. Can we truly say that those things which are established to promote goodness in the world are in accord with the will of Heaven, or the mind of Heaven and Earth, if in fact Heaven is so cruel?[1]

We would be led far from our purposes if we paused to consider the appropriateness of these criticisms, interesting as they are. Suffice it to say that Ts'ung-mi believed that Buddhist doctrine on the origin of man and things, by placing the responsibility within man's consciousness, answers all of these questions to which in his view, the Confucian-Taoist theory cannot reply. Ts'ung-mi concludes:

---

1. Taishō 45, p. 708b-c; de Bary, pp. 182-85.

> The purport of teachings other than Buddhism lies in establishing proper conduct for oneself, not in inquiring into the origin of oneself. In their discussions of the myriad creatures, they exclude that which lies beyond the phenomenal world. Although they point to the Great Way as their source, they do not clarify in detail the order of the causes and conditions of their defilements and purifications, of their coming into existence and going out of existence. Unaware that their teachings are provisional, students hold these doctrines as final....It is evident that the followers of these teachings will be unable to get to the origin of man.[1]

It is both historically significant and intriguing that Ts'ung-mi in this work lumps Confucianism and Taoism together and asserts that they espouse one explanation of the origin of things. In another work, his Yüan-chüeh ching ta-shu-ch'ao,[2] Ts'ung-mi makes it clear that his idea of Taoist explanation of the origin of men and things is taken from the Lao-tzu and its commentaries,[3] whereas his conception of the ideas of the Confucian school is taken from the I Ching,[4] and that he finds the Lao-tzu and the I Ching to be in basic agreement on the origin of things.

In the Lao-tzu, according to Ts'ung-mi, we are told that in the original chaos before the generation of Heaven and Earth and all things, the Tao gave rise to the one original ch'i, which in turn gave birth to the yang ch'i 陽氣 and the yin ch'i 陰氣. The yin ch'i descended to become the Earth, and the yang ch'i ascended to become Heaven. Man

---

1. Taishō 45, p. 708a-b and 708c; de Bary, pp. 182 and 185.

2. Found in Zokuzōkyō 1, 14, 4 (Hereafter cited as Ta-shu-ch'ao). Cf. Kamata, Shūmitsu, pp. 128-34.

3. Chiefly that of Ho-shang Kung 河上公 (fl. 170 B.C.).

4. Supplemented with ideas from the Lieh-tzu and from commentaries on the I Ching.

was born of the union of these two ch'i; from these three came the eight trigrams and the myriad things. The Lao-tzu also tells us that man is to imitate (fa 法) Earth, which imitates Heaven; the commentaries tell us that man is to imitate Heaven as well--in imitating both man will come into harmony with the pure and unforced spontaneous action of the Tao, which causes all things to be transformed of themselves.[1]

The I Ching's statement that the T'ai-chi 太極 gives birth to the two I 儀 seemed to Tsung-mi to be a very similar idea expressed in a different vocabulary. Then, the I Ching tells us, the two I gave birth to the four symbols, which stand for the four constituent elements of Heaven and Earth: fire, wood, water and metal. These were extended to form the eight trigrams, and from there came good and ill fortune, and all of the affairs of the world.[2] Tsung-mi finds this account identical in basic purport to that found in the Lao-tzu. Thus, where the origin of things is concerned, it makes sense to consider the two non-Buddhist teachings as one.[3]

---

1. The relevant chapters of the Lao-tzu are Chapters 25 and 42. The above paragraph paraphrases Zokuzōkyō 1, 14, 4, p. 352b, which is quoted in Kamata (Shūmitsu, p. 129).

2. Zokuzōkyō, 1, 14, 4, p. 352b-d, quoted in Kamata, Shūmitsu, p. 130. The relevant passage of the I Ching is Ta-chuan (The Great Treatise, chapter yu 10, in T'ao Tsung-han, ed., I-ching chi-chu (Taipei: Hsin-lu Shu-chü, 1968), p. 103. In Cary F. Baynes' translation into English of Richard Wilhelm's translation into German, The I Ching or Book of Changes (3rd ed., Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967), this passage is in Ta-chuan, chapter XI, section 5, p. 318.

3. Tsung-mi does not make the mistake of considering the two teachings to be identical throughout. Again taking the Lao-tzu as representative of the Taoist tradition, he contrasts in the same section of his Ta-shu-ch'ao the Confucian's interest in loyalty, filial piety, benevolence, righteousness, rites and music, benefit to state, love of family and eminence in the world to the Taoist's lack of interest in these things. Ta-shu-ch'ao, chüan 7a. Zokuzōkyō 1, 14, 4, p. 352a-b, quoted in Kamata, Shūmitsu, p. 129.

Buddhism's explanation differs from that of the Lao-tzu and the I ing, according to Ts'ung-mi, in placing the origin of all things in one nd.[1] Once that fundamental difference is understood, it becomes clear at while the teachings of Buddhism on the one hand and the indigenous inese schools on the other hand can be shown to have remarkable paral- ls in structure, they do not teach the same thing. As an example ne to which Ta-hui refers approvingly,[see below), Ts'ung-mi sees a rallel between the activities and virtues of the creative forces repre- nted by the fundamental I Ching hexagrams Ch'ien 乾 (whose essence to be active without rest) and K'un 坤 (whose essence is to be still d quiet) on the one hand and the active Buddha (Enlightened Mind) and e "lonely and still Nirvana" (nieh-pan chi-mieh 涅槃寂滅) the other.[2]

Ch'ien is the name given to the activity (yung 用) of which aven is the substance (t'i 體). The sage taught men the activity Heaven in the I Ching in order that men might imitate the activity d achieve the essence (t'i) of Heaven. The sage, imitating the aseless activity which is the natural principle of Heaven, ceaselessly ds men in their affairs. Ch'ien represents strength, correctness, and rity as well. Its four virtues, yuan 元 , heng 亨 , li 利 , and

---

Cf. his own preface to the Yüan-chüeh ching ta-shu, Zokuzōkyō 1, 14, p. 108d (quoted in Kamata, Shūmitsu, p. 131). As a synonym for the e Mind he substitutes "Perfect Enlightenment" (yüan-chüeh 圓覺) a similar passage in his Yüan-chüeh ching lueh-shu-ch'ao (hereafter ted as Lueh-shu-ch'ao), chüan 5, Zokuzōkyō 1, 15, 1, p. 133c-d.

Cf. Kamata (Shūmitsu, p. 131), where the Ta-shu-ch'ao is quoted, and bota (pp. 439-46), where the Lueh-shu-ch'ao, chüan 1 (Zokuzōkyō, 1, 15, p. 90f.) is quoted at length.

en 貞 , which Ts'ung-mi, following a commentary, glosses as "begin-
ng, penetrating, bringing into harmony and firmly correcting,"
scribe fully the essence of Ch'ien, or Heaven's activity in and in
lation to all things. The four positive attributes of the Buddha
r enlightened Mind), namely permanence, joy, selfhood and purity
h'ang 常 , le 樂 , wo 我 , and ching 淨), likewise fully express
e essence of enlightenment.[1]

Ts'ung-mi further extends the parallel in a discussion of the modes
practice of the indigenous schools of Buddhism. In the indigenous
achings, he says, the four virtues of Ch'ien originate from one primal
rce (Ch'i 氣), just as the four virtues of the Buddha all arise from
e One Mind. The teaching of the indigenous schools is that one must
turn to the one Ch'i by concentrating that one Ch'i in oneself.
'ung-mi quotes the Lao-tzu as saying: "Concentrate the one Ch'i and
ach softness."[2] A commentary elaborates, saying that the original
'i is the spontaneous Great Way, and its nature is still, quiet and
ak. Therefore softness can produce movement, hardness and strength.
en a man can rest in stillness and silence and preserve softness and
akness, he attains the Way and can preserve his life, achieve and
mplete all things, become the lord of men and bring the empire to
rmony. Therefore, says Ts'ung-mi, those who can attain the Way

---

Lüeh-shu-ch'ao, quoted in Kubota, pp. 441-44. The five constant
rtues (benevolence, righteousness, propriety, wisdom and good faith),
e four seasons, and the five elements are all shown to correspond in
sence to these four virtues of Ch'ien. Cf. Kubota, p. 442.

Cf. Lao-tzu, chapter 10.

concentrate only on this resolve and reach the original Ch'i of quietness and softness. That is what is meant by "achieving the Way." Because the Tao is soft and weak, it embraces and unites all things. Thus if one accords with the Way of Ch'ien one can bring to correctness the Nature and Destiny of all things and preserve the great harmony: that is what is meant by harmonizing (li 利) and correcting (chen 貞).[1]

The actual method used in the process of self-cultivation of the indigenous schools, says Ts'ung-mi, is to harmonize the Ch'i, so that the yin ch'i and the yang ch'i can be brought together into one. This unification is done by breathing deeply and setting the mind into unbroken quietness so that it does not follow after or turn toward anything, and so that all fabrications are cut off. When the mind does not move, one becomes one with the original Ch'i.[2]

The four virtues of the Buddha for their part are based on the One Mind. Therefore there is no practice in Buddhism that is not a practice of the mind. Any other kind of practice would be like polishing a roof-tile to make a mirror, or refining iron in order to obtain gold. Ts'ung-mi quotes his Hua-yen teacher Ch'eng-kuan to the effect that none of the myriad practices in Buddhism depart from the mind; if one awakens and understands the vastness of one's own mind, all practices will be brought to completion in that one final pure thought. He then quotes the Hua-yen sūtra, to support the view that all of the virtues

---

1. Lüeh-shu-ch'ao, chüan 1, quoted in Kubota, pp. 444-45.

2. Ibid., p. 445.

practiced by the Bodhisattva on his path relate to the One Mind in that they prepare the mind for enlightenment, and quotes the Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna to the effect that all dharmas are products of the One Mind.[1]

Ts'ung-mi represents a definite advance in the profundity of the comparison between Buddhism and the indigenous teachings, not only in his erudition, care and systematic treatment, but also more importantly in that he compares not only moral teachings but fundamental doctrines and practice. In drawing out these parallels, Ts'ung-mi makes no direct suggestion that these paths to cultivation lead to the same goal or have the same effect on the one who follows them to the goal.[2]

B. "Three Teachings Thought" in the Northern Sung

The attack by Han Yü on Buddhism in the ninth century, to which Ts'ung-mi's Yüan-jen lun may have been a response, apparently had far more influence in the early decades of the Northern Sung than it had had during Han Yü's lifetime.[3] Han Yü became a hero and a model to the generation that included Fan Chung-yen and Ou-yang Hsiu, in large part because of his revolutionary advocacy of a literary style known as ku-wen, but also because of his objection to Buddhism as an economic, political and social phenomenon. The subject of the detrimental effects of Buddhism's wealth and large tax-free landholdings, its removal of able-bodied men and women from the labor force, its turning of men's

---

1. Ibid., quoted in Kubota, pp. 445-46.

2. Cf. de Bary, p. 179.

3. Kubota (pp. 387-437) treats the Buddhist responses to Han Yü's attacks.

interests away from social problems, its failure to support the social norms of family and polity, its intellectual hold on men of education and talent, and the consequent weakening of the state and of Confucian ideology and education, was raised again and again in the early Northern Sung period by Confucians of every variety.[1] The most outstanding intellectual opponents of Buddhism were Hu Yüan 胡瑗,[2] Ou-yang Hsiu and Ssu-ma Kuang. Ou-yang Hsiu's famous essay Pen lun 本論 (On Fundamentals), written in 1041, was perhaps the high point of the movement.[3]

The response from Buddhists was to adopt the position that Buddhism was not detrimental to the polity and society, that its ethical teachings in particular were identical in essence to those of Confucianism, and that for good government and harmonious society all three of the Three Teachings were needed. Outstanding among the monastic defenders of the faith was Ch'i-sung 契嵩 (1007-1072),[4] whose essays in defense of the view that "the Three Teachings return to one" revived traditional ethical arguments (e.g., that the "five constant virtues" of

---

1. James T. C. Liu (Ou-yang Hsiu [Stanford, California; Stanford University Press, 1967], pp. 158-72) and Kubota (pp. 460-520) discuss these criticisms in some detail.

2. Cf. Kubota, p. 484.

3. Liu, Ou-Yang Hsiu, pp. 163-171; Kubota, pp. 460-67.

4. Ch'i-sung's essays are collected in his Hsün-chin wen-chi 鐔津文集 Taishō 52, pp. 646c-750c. Ch'i-sung's Fu-chiao p'ien 輔教編 was written in direct response to Ou-yang Hsiu's Pen lun. Jan Yun-hua has contributed a good short biography of Ch'i-sung to Herbert Franke, ed., Sung Biographies, 3 vols. (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1976), I, pp. 185-94.

ucianism correspond and in essence are identical to the "five epts" and the "ten good practices" of Buddhism),[1] but did so in an ant ku-wen style and with much display of literary skill and ition. He even succeeded in making a friend of his chief opponent, ang Hsiu. In his essays he assumes the point of view of his ated Confucian opponents, and tries to show how Buddhism should be ptable to them, given their values and assumptions. For example, he :

> It was found impossible to govern the people through benevolence and righteousness alone, and Buddhism was therefore promulgated everywhere in China and has since become a parallel teaching to Confucianism. People have been transformed under its influence: potential criminals have been turned into good people; scholars have relied on it to regulate their understanding of Nature and Destiny; and in general, it has now become one of the doctrines immensely benefitting the people. Hence I say that Buddhism is indispensable because of its supplementary nature in helping one's generation. As to its preaching of the existence of another world after one's death, although it cannot be witnessed when one is still alive, there are things which are evident if one ponders them with reason.[2]

In his Kuang yüan-chiao p'ien 廣原教編, Ch'i-sung argues the minds of the sages (Buddha, Lao-tzu, Confucius) are one in that wish to promote goodness in all men; the teachings, however, though in what they intend, are different in form, and there are differences ofundity and shallowness. The empire should not do away with any

---

n his Yüan-chiao p'ien, in Hsün-chin wen-chi, Taishō 52, pp. 648c-

sün-chin wen-chi, chüan 1, p. 653a. Translated by Liu Ts'un-yan,
.

of the Three Teachings, for to destroy any one of them would be to harm the Good Way and increase evil.[1]

Elsewhere he says:

> Buddhism is my doctrine. I have studied Confucianism also, and I have some interest in the sayings of Lao-tzu. If I am permitted to use a parable, I would say that they [the Three Teachings] can be likened to the crossing of the ford: some go through with their clothes on because the water is deep, some hold them up because the water is shallow. The Confucians produce sages to rule the secular world, and the Buddhists produce sages to administer the monastic world.[2]

In this last passage Ch'i-sung suggests that the goal of the Three Teachings (he sees Confucius and Lao-tzu as belonging to one tradition, as did Ts'ung-mi) is the same, but the realms of conduct to which each applies are different. This "separate realm" line of argument was to be repeated later by Ta-hui, and by the Emperor Hsiao Tsung in 1181, who repeated the theme in his Yüan-Tao lun 原道論, by saying:

> Buddhism should be employed to cultivate the mind, Taoism to nourish oneself, and Confucianism to rule the world.[3]

Most of the Northern Sung emperors viewed Buddhism quite favorably and supported it consistently. But shortly after Hui Tsung ascended the

---

1. Kuang yüan-chiao p'ien, in Hsün-chin wen-chi, chüan 2, Taishō 52, pp. 654b-60a; cf. especially p. 660a.

2. Hsün-chin wen-chi, chüan 1, Taishō 52, p. 651c. The parable is found in the Book of Odes (Shih Ching). Cf. Legge, The Chinese Classics, V, Pt. I, Bk. III, Ode IX, p. 53. Translation follows that of Liu Ts'un-yan, p. 43, with minor changes.

3. Quoted in Fo-tsu t'ung-chi, chüan 47, Taishō 49, p. 430; also in Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai, chüan 20, Taishō 49, p. 692c.

throne, he began to show definite signs of wishing to suppress Buddhism in favor of Taoism.[1] Some time between 1101 and 1106 he issued an edict saying:

> In the past the portraits of the leaders of the Three Teachings were usually hung together in a hall in Buddhist monasteries and such a hall was generally known as "the Hall of the Three Teachings." In such an arrangement, the portrait of Śakyamuni was placed in the middle and was flanked by Lao-tzu's portrait on its left and Confucius' on its right. This is a sacrilege towards the Lord on High and the Confucian sage. The portraits of both Lao-tzu and Confucius are therefore to be returned to Taoist monasteries or Confucian schools where they belong, and the name of the halls is to be rectified.[2]

In 1119, even the name of Buddha in Buddhist temples was changed by imperial order to "the Golden Immortal of Great Enlightenment" (Ta-chüeh Chin-hsien 大覺金仙),[3] a title with a distinctly Taoist flavor that would suggest to worshipers that the Buddha was an immortal in the Taoist pantheon.

Faced with this threat of imperial disfavor, both monks and lay Buddhists rose to the defense of the faith. The monks Yung-tao 永道, Wu-ming 悟明 and Hui-jih 慧日 petitioned the government for reconsideration, basically repeating, in a somewhat more impassioned form, Ch'i-sung's arguments about the historical role of Buddhism.[4]

---

1. Cf. Kubota, pp. 453-59. Fo-tsu t'ung-chi and Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai are major sources for this episode.

2. Fo-tsu t'ung-chi, chüan 46, Taishō 49, p. 419a.

3. Kubota, p. 455.

4. Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai, chüan 19, Taishō 49, pp. 683b-84b quotes this petition at length.

Outstanding among the lay defenders was the former Chief Minister, Chang Shang-ying, who later befriended Ta-hui. In 1110, Chang Shang-ying wrote an essay called the Hu-fa lun 護法論.[1] While in this work Chang's primary aim was to defend the truth and the social utility of Buddhism specifically against the attacks of Han Yü and Ou-yang Hsiu, whom he criticised very severely, he did suggest that like the three legs of a ting 鼎 (three-footed sacrificial vessel), all three of the Three Teachings were necessary to the state.[2]

---

1. Taishō 52, pp. 637-46.

2. The simile of the three-footed sacrifical vessel had had a long history when Chang used it. Wang T'ung had employed it in the sixth century, and the Taoist Ch'en T'uan had used it in the tenth century (cf. Kubota, pp. 294-98 and p. 522). Chang's use of this image is found in Taishō 52, p. 643c. In the essay Chang also replied directly and by name to Ch'eng I's statement that Buddhists tried to leave the world, but that that was impossible. Ch'eng I had said: "Buddhism has the doctrine that one should leave the family and the world....As for the world, how can one leave it? To leave the world can only mean no longer having the sky above you and the earth below you. Nonetheless they drink when they are thirsty and eat when they are hungry, have the sky above them and the earth below" (Honan Ch'eng-shih i-shu, chüan 18, Kuo-hsüeh chi-pen ts'ung-shu edition, p. 216, line 8f; Graham's translation, p. 86). Chang replied: "In this generation I-chuan Ch'eng I has said, 'The Buddhists talk about "leaving the world" (ch'u-shih 出世). Unless one doesn't walk upon the earth one cannot talk about having left the world.' When shih-tai-fu talk about Buddhism in total ignorance of its profound (meanings), they talk like this. It is elementary knowledge that [in Buddhism] [the five skandhas] of form, sensation, perceptions, habit-formation and consciousness are the worldly dharmas, while precepts, samādhi, Prajñā, vimoksa (liberation) and the knowledge and vision of liberation are the dharmas that are beyond the world (ch'u shih-chien fa 出世間法). Enlightened students of Buddhism, those who are able to attain the dharmas that are beyond the world, may be said to have 'left the world' (ch'u-shih 出世)" (Hu-fa lun, Taishō 52, p. 642c).

Unlike Ch'i-sung, Chang was not in any mood to be conciliatory toward Confucian opponents, and although he answered their arguments, he did not try to justify Buddhism from their point of view. He argued that the Three Teachings are the same in a certain sense, in that they are all medicines for the fundamental delusion of man. But he said that Confucianism can be compared to a medicine that cures diseases of the skin, Taoism to a medicine that cures diseases of the blood, and Buddhism to that which cures diseases of the bones, that is, the most radical and deep-seated diseases.[1] His arguments remind one of the reasoning of earlier Buddhists such as K'ang Seng-hui who for purposes of defenese admitted that the Three Teachings are similar, but insisted that Buddhist teachings are more thorough-going and profound than those of the two indigenous traditions.

Thus in the Northern Sung both Ch'i-sung and Chang Shang-ying suggested that the Three Teachings were similar in intent; all three supported morality, improved men's characters and made good government possible. But in the writings of neither Chang nor Ch'i-sung do we find any real interest in arguing that realization of the Tao in all three cases brings with it fundamentally the same change in consciousness, the same kind of sagely mind. Interestingly enough, during the Northern Sung period it was a Taoist, Ch'en T'uan 陳摶 (d. 989) who once more compared the Three Teachings from the point of view of practice, as Ts'ung-mi had done. He suggested that the goal of Confucian teaching and practice was to cultivate one's person (<u>hsiu-shen</u> 修身) by means of

---

1. <u>Taishō</u> 52, p. 643a.

correcting one's mind and making one's will sincere (cheng-hsin ch'eng-i 正心誠意). The goal of Taoist practice was to nourish one's life (yang sheng 養生) by refining one's body and nourishing one's ch'i (lien-shen yang-ch'i 煉身養氣). The goal of the Buddhists was to awaken to Mind (wu-hsin 悟心) by clarifying one's mind and seeing one's Nature (ming-hsin chien-hsing 明心見性). But Ch'en went further than Ts'ung-mi in suggesting that to achieve all three is to achieve the foundation of self-cultivation.[1]

Attitudes of Tao-hsüeh Scholars toward Buddhism

Among Confucians the opposition to Buddhism as a heterodox and harmful doctrine, which had been begun by Ou-yang Hsiu and others of his generation, continued throughout the Northern Sung period. There were exceptions: Wang An-shih, whose coming to power in 1071 resulted in the dismissal from office of Ssu-ma Kuang, Ch'eng Hao, Chang Tsai and others, was favorable to and quite interested in Buddhism,[2] and even many Confucians who saw their Way as distinct from and opposed to that of Buddhism had studied Buddhism in their youth and continued throughout their lives to have friends among the monks and to visit monasteries for conversation with Ch'an and other Buddhist teachers. The leaders of the Tao-hsüeh movement, however, were especially critical of Buddhism, seeing it not only as a social ill, but also as a tempting heresy into which students of the Confucian Way might be lured. The Sung Yüan hsüeh-an records:

---

1. Mu-yen wen-chi 木巖文集 , chüan 2, quoted in Kubota, p. 522.

2. James T. C. Liu (Reform in Sung China, pp. 35-36), argues that Wang An-shih's interest in Buddhism was life-long.

> I-ch'uan (Ch'eng I) returned from Fu-chou [in Szechuan, where he had been in exile from 1097 to perhaps 1101], he found that most of his former students had scattered and many were in pursuit of Buddhism. Only [Yang Shih] and [Hsieh Liang-tso] had not given up [their original studies]. [Ch'eng I] said with a sigh: "All of them have joined the barbarians, only Yang and Hsieh have advanced."[1]

However, even Yang and Hsieh, along with most of the other prominent ciples of the Ch'eng brothers, remained attracted to Buddhism despite warnings of their teachers. The question of the differences and ilarities between the two traditions remained a much discussed and esolved question among the followers of Ch'eng I, particularly after death in 1107. Among the most prominent immediate disciples and irect students of the Ch'eng brothers and Ssu-ma Kuang were Yang h (1053-1135), Yu Tso (1053-1132), Hsieh Liang-tso (1050-1103), en Kuan (1057-1122 or 1060-1124), Yin Tun (1071-1142), Hu An-kuo 74-1138) and Liu An-shih (1048-1125). These men and their students e the individuals most responsible for the continuation and spread the teachings of the Ch'eng brothers, and for the prestige of Tao-eh in the early Southern Sung. None of them could have had any doubt t the "orthodox" position of Ssu-ma Kuang and of the Ch'eng brothers' ool was that Buddhism was heterodox, pernicious, and to be avoided. all of them, with the exception of Hu An-kuo and possibly Yin Tun,

---

This anecdote is contained in Yang Shih's biography in the SYHA, an 25, p. 12b (I, p. 466). Wing-tsit Chan says in his biography of eng I (in Herbert Franke, ed., Sung Biographies, I, p. 177) that eng I was pardoned three years after his exile, and returned to hing at the National Academy at the capital.

und themselves attracted to Buddhism. Many expressed the suspicion conviction that the practice of the two, or three, teachings brought e to the same goal.

One leading example, Yang Shih, is said to have become very iterested in Buddhism in his later years. His interest does not)pear to have been merely the emotional response of a man approaching ld age. Instead, Yang Shih appears to have brought to Buddhism the ame experiential and philosophical questions and interests that oncerned him as a Tao-hsüeh Confucian. For example, he found in the uddhist Vijñānavadin teachings about the ten levels of consciousness profound explanation of the relation between phenomenal good and evil nd the "originally good Nature" of Mencius that Ch'eng I had affirmed. le is quoted as saying in his Recorded Sayings that the Amala conscious- ness whose name when translated into Chinese meant "spotless and pure" was identical to Mencius' "good Nature," while the Ālaya or "storehouse" consciousness contains the seeds of good and evil.[1] He also is quoted as saying that the two famous lines by Layman P'ang (P'ang Yün 龐蘊, the outstanding disciple of the Ch'an teacher Ma-tsu 馬祖):

> My supernatural power and marvelous activity:
> Drawing water and carrying firewood[2]

---

1. SYHA, chüan 25, p. 7b (I, p. 464).

2. Iriya Yoshitaka, ed. and trans., Hōkoshi goroku (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1973), p. 15. Cf. Ruth Fuller Sasaki, et al., The Recorded Sayings of Layman P'ang (New York and Tokyo: John Weatherhill, Inc., 1971), p. 46. I have used Sasaki's translation.

expressed the Way of the movements of the sage-kings Yao and Shun.[1] He further compared the "four maladies" of the Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment to the mistakes in cultivating the mind that Mencius had pointed out in his famous parable of the man of Sung who tried to help his plants to grow. The malady called tso 作 ("works") in the sūtra, Yang said, was the same as the mistake of "pulling on the plants to help them to grow" in Mencius' parable. The malady of chih 止 ("stopping of all mental effort") in the sūtra was the same as not weeding, and the maladies of jen 任 ("laissez-faire") and mieh 滅 ("annihilation of all desire") in the sūtra were the same as wu shih 無事, not having the task in mind and sticking with it, an attitude the opposite to that expressed by Mencius in Chinese as yu shih 有事, having the task at hand constantly on one's mind.[2] Yang is quoted further as saying that the Confucian affirmation that form is Heaven's Nature is the same as the Buddhist idea that "form is emptiness."[3] He also quoted the Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa as saying that

---

1. SYHA, chuan 25, p. 8b (I, 464).

2. For this parable, cf. Hsieh Ping-ying, et al., eds., Hsin-i ssu-shu tu-pen, p. 287 and James Legge, The Works of Mencius (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1970; reprint of the 2nd, revised edition published by the Clarendon Press, Oxford, in 1895 as Vol. II of The Chinese Classics), Book II, Part I, Chapter 2, section 16, pp. 190-91. For the "four maladies (ssu ping 四病), see W. E. Soothill and Lewis Hodous, A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., Ltd., 1937), p. 178.

3. The phrase "form is emptiness" appears in many different Buddhist works, but was doubtless most familiar to Chinese as the opening passage of the teaching of Avalokiteśvara in the Prajñāpāramitā-hrdaya (Heart) sūtra (Taishō 8, p. 847c). In English see Edward Conze, Buddhist Wisdom Books (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1958), p. 81.

: True Mind is the place of enlightenment,[1] and he commented that on .s point the truth taught by Buddhists and Confucians was one.[2]

Ch'en Kuan was another who found identity in the teachings of the) schools; he wrote:

> The essence of Buddhism does not rely on words, nor does it depart from words. Reading the Diamond Sūtra alone would be sufficient [to understand the doctrine]. In the past I have looked down on those scholar-officials who gave up worldly affairs to devote all their time to the study of this sūtra. I understand now that they were not so silly as I had thought. The key characters in this sūtra are only nine: A-nou-to-lo san-miao-san-p'u-t'i (Anuttara-samyaksambodhi) which is chüeh 覺 (Wisdom) in Chinese, and it is the same as the ch'eng 誠 (sincerity) in the Doctrine of the Mean.[3]

Liu An-shih, who was a disciple of Ssu-ma Kuang, apparently did not are his teacher's staunch refusal to tolerate Buddhism. A later nfucian scholar wrote of him:

> Because of his deep-seated belief in Buddhism which he had studied before he studies Confucianism, he went so far as to say that the minds of Confucius, Buddha, the Taoist patriarchs, and the gods were one. He said also that the passage in the Lotus sūtra stating that the executioner's sword would break into pieces [when the prisoners called upon Avalokitésvara, the Regarder of the Cries of the World] was meant as an illustration of the Nature.[4]

Cf. Robert A. F. Thurman, trans., The Holy Teaching of Vimala-rti (University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University ess, 1976), ch. 5, p. 44.

SYHA, chüan 25, pp. 8b-9a (I, pp. 464-65).

SYHA, chüan 35, p. 8b (I, p. 581); Liu Ts'un-yan's translation, 18 (I have made minor changes). Ch'en Kuan's biography can be found SS, chüan 345.

SYHA, chüan 20, p. 12b (I, p. 410). The later scholar was Huang en 黃震 (d. c. 1276).

Such ready willingness to see similarity or identity in the two teachings and the experiences of self-transformation to which they pointed as goals was of course not universal among these prominent Tao-hsueh Confucians. But even Hsieh Liang-tso, who in important respects was critical of Buddhism, affirmed their similarities and felt that it was necessary to keep an open mind.[1] Typical of his critical approach to Buddhism is the following passage explaining his views on the meaning of jen (benevolence):

> What is the [activity of] mind for? It is for jen. What is jen? That which is alive is jen, and that which is not alive is not jen. When a man becomes paralyzed and numbed, he is medically described as not jen. The kernel in the stone of a peach or apricot, capable of being planted and yielding fruit, is also named jen because of its will to bring new life into the world. The meaning of jen can be seen from such examples. The Buddhists describe such an understanding as "seeing the Nature," but take it consequently as the end of their pursuit. That is why their doctrine is to be regarded as absurd. When a scholar at the gates of the Sage [Confucius] comes to it, he will make more effort [to cultivate himself] at the first sign.[2]

This passage points to what Hsieh believed to be a fundamental difference between Confucian and Buddhist teachings, but it also assumes a fundamental identity: the Confucian's experiential understanding of jen is seen as identical to the important experience the Buddhists call "seeing the Nature," or enlightenment. Thus it is not inconsistent for

---

1. Cf. Kubota, p. 498.

2. SYHA, chüan 24, p. 2a (I, p. 448); Liu Ts'un-yan's translation, p. 21 (I have made some changes in the translation). Chu Hsi later criticized Hsieh Liang-tso, saying: "When Shang-tsai [Hsieh Liang-tso] talked about jen or chüeh (enlightenment), he was very clearly talking about Ch'an" (SYHA, chüan 24, p. 16a (I, p. 455).

Hsieh to say, in his preface to his Introduction to the Analects (Lun-yü chieh 論語解):

> To compare this work with the concentration of one's spirit advocated by the Taoists and the cultivation of one's mind advocated by the scholars of the West [i.e., the Buddhists], I can only say that they are riding bridle to bridle and that it is impossible to argue their good and bad points with one's mouth and tongue.[1]

A similar attitude was shown by Yu Tso when explaining to the junior scholar Lü Pen-chung (later one of Ta-hui's most faithful students) why he was interested in studying Ch'an. He said:

> The teachings in the Buddhist works have not been carefully scrutinized by us Confucians. In the past I heard I-ch'uan [Ch'eng I] say, "What I attack in Buddhism are traces (i.e., external manifestations, not first principles). But where do such traces come from?" [I believe that] one would not be able really to differentiate between the similarities and differences in these two teachings unless one had personally "entered the realm." If one has not done so, verbal arguments are of no use at all.[2]

Clearly a change had taken place in the attitude toward Buddhism of many of the Confucian scholars of the lines of Ssu-ma Kuang and the Ch'eng brothers. Whereas the generation of Ou-yang Hsiu had criticised Buddhism's doctrines and social effects, the Tao-hsüeh scholar-officials of the late Northern and early Southern Sung dared to go beyond differences of symbol and name to explore similarities in the experiences

---

1. SYHA, chüan 24, p. 116 (I, p. 452); Liu Ts'un-yan's translation, p. 41 (I have made minor changes in the translation).

2. SYHA, chüan 26, p. 3a-b (I, p. 484). Lü is quoted as quoting his own letter to his teacher and his teacher's reply. Yu Tso also says in this reply that earlier Confucians often attacked Buddhism without ever having read Buddhist literature.

aimed at and achieved by the two schools. They even went so far as to say that comparison was fruitless without personal knowledge of the kinds of enlightenment which had inspired the teachings of the sages of the three traditions, and which remained the goal sought by their followers.

In the records of Ta-hui's teachings we can observe a similar change taking place simultaneously in the attitude of Buddhists toward Taoism and Confucianism. Rather than merely asserting that all made contributions to a good society, or that all taught similar ethical principles and practices, or that all had similar goals, but that there were important differences in degree of profundity, as had his predecessors Ts'ung-mi, Ch'i-sung and Chang Shang-ying, Ta-hui boldly asserted that the goals of the three teachings were one, that enlightenment was both the method and goal of all three. In the next chapter we shall explore Ta-hui's views.

Chapter IV: Ta-hui and Confucian Teachings: Three Teachings Return to One, Part II

Ta-hui approached Confucian and Taoist teachings from a particular stance, that of an active Ch'an master and teacher of Buddhism. He did not engage in systematic comparison, as had Tsung-mi and Ch'i-sung; nor, although he was aware of Han Yü's criticism, did he seek directly to "defend the faith" as had Ch'i-sung and Chang Shang-ying. Ta-hui was a Ch'an teacher interested above all in enlightenment, not doctrine, and there was never any doubt in his mind that enlightenment was the realization of a single, absolute truth. If Ta-hui were to believe Taoist and Confucian teachings and practices to be true, it must be because they were expressions of the truth realized by Buddhists in enlightenment. For this reason, to understand his view of Confucian and Taoist truth we must first summarize the basic understanding of truth which he held as a Buddhist.

Like other Chinese Buddhists of his period, Ta-hui believed that there were two kinds, or levels, of truth.[1] One is the level of the One

---

1. Ta-hui did not teach any particular doctrinal formulation of the levels of truth. He was certainly familiar with the teaching of two levels of truth by Nāgārjuna and the Three Treatise (San Lun 三論) School, as he shows, for example, in his recounting of the story of Bodhidharma's meeting with Liang Wu-ti. Here he clarifies the point of the dialogue between the two by reminding his listeners of the teaching of worldly truth (su t'i 俗諦, samvriti-satya) and higher truth (chen t'i 真諦, paramārtha-satya) as a gloss on Liang Wu-ti's question about "the first meaning of the holy truth (sheng t'i ti-i-i 聖諦第一義)" (P'u Shuo, p. 461a). Nonetheless it would be misleading to identify Ta-hui's ideas with those of Nāgārjuna and his school, for my description of Ta-hui's ideas is drawn not from doctrinal statements of his but from my own analysis of the structure of his teaching. Although the likelihood is strong that Ta-hui's ideas reflect the indirect influence of Nāgārjuna's ideas,

Mind or the Buddha-Nature, which is also the level on which it is true that all phenomena are empty of any reality which could be predicated, that is, of any independent eternal reality. The second level is the level on which ordinary experience is lived, in which we can and must assume that things have real, independent existences that correspond to names and that enable them to act as causes in networks of cause and effect. This is the level the truth of which is described by the doctrine of karmic cause and effect. Enlightenment comes when one can realize the truth of the highest level, that is, of the One Mind or Buddha Nature, and the emptiness of all things, and yet live at peace in the world of phenomena whose "reality" we assume and confront every day. When one can do this one can realize that the realm of "emptiness" is also the realm of "suchness," the realm of the miraculous "as-it-is-ness" of the phenomenal world.

How can one reach this integrated realization of the two levels of truth in the One Mind of Enlightenment? There are two paths to realization. The first is the path followed by ordinary men, sometimes therefore called the "ordinary norm"[1] or, in the term of Melford Spiro,

---

we have no evidence that he read any text of the Three Treatise School, or that he would have preferred the samvriti-satya/ paramārtha-satya doctrinal formulation to any other doctrinal formulation.

1. After Franklin Edgerton, "Dominant Ideas in the Formation of Indian Culture," JAOS, LXII (1942), pp. 151-56.

"karmic Buddhism".[1] This path is one of self-restraint, self-denial, a moral life, making merit by good deeds which will plant the seeds of future salvation or enlightenment. The second path, usually associated with the monastic life and therefore sometimes called the "extraordinary norm,"[2] or "Nirvanic Buddhism,"[3] is the path of leaving daily concerns behind and employing all one's energies in the search for a direct glimpse of one's own real "empty" Buddha-Nature. This experience is a vision of the highest truth, for one's own Buddha-Nature (or Mind) is identical with the Buddha-Nature (or One Mind) of all things. Both the lay and the monastic path lead to an experiential understanding of that power that constitutes oneself and all that is; the "ordinary" path, however, being more gradual, is thought by Ta-hui and others usually not to yield this experience in this lifetime. This experience of the transcendent Buddha-Nature or One Mind is a "going beyond the world"; monks "go out of the world" in order to try to attain it. Ta-hui believed that laymen may also attain it without going out of the world, for one can practice the "extraordinary" path in all of one's activities.[4]

---

1. Melford Spiro makes a distinction between "Nibbanic Buddhism" as a religion of "radical salvation" whose aim is to transcend samsāra, and "Kammatic Buddhism" as a religion of "proximate salvation" whose aim is to enhance one's status within samsāra (Buddhism and Society [New York and Evanston, Ill.: Harper and Row, 1970], pp. 31-91). I have used his terms, but have given them Sanskrit forms.

2. See note 1 previous page.

3. See note 1 above.

4. See Chapter VII below.

A. The Three Teachings and Ethics

How does Ta-hui see truth in Confucian teaching in the light of his experience of and commitment to this Buddhist understanding of enlightenment? In the first place, Ta-hui accepts Confucian categories as the language appropriate to the ethical dimension of the world of everyday life, and equates ethical behavior in fulfilling the norms of Confucianism with the good deeds that in the Buddhist scheme earn merit for the doer.

In the past, as we have seen especially in the case of Ch'i-sung, the question of the relation of Buddhist and Confucian ethics and values had been treated chiefly in two ways. One way was to maintain that social institutions and their concomitant etiquette and moral standards were the realm in which Confucian teaching properly held sway, while Buddhist precepts were concerned only with individual achievement of Buddhahood. Thus these precepts affected only those who were "out of the world" (ch'u chia 出家 , ch'u shih 出世) i.e., monks, or those laymen who made "extraordinary" religious efforts. The other way was the attempt to show that the virtues that Buddhists sought to realize, and in particular the precepts that lay Buddhists followed, were in essence the same as the traditional Confucian virtues.

Ta-hui conceded that there is truth in the first view: it may be true that Confucian virtues and Buddhist virtues are related on the deepest level in that both spring from one source of human goodness, and that they ultimately lead to one goal of personal realization of truth, but on the phenomenal level they are concerned with conduct in different realms and therefore have different goals. Ta-hui quotes with

approval the view of Feng Chi-ch'uan[1] 馮濟川 that "the Buddha emphasizes a teaching beyond worldly pleasures and responsibilities, while Confucius emphasizes worldly moral categories." Confucian teachings are concerned with the production of life and the continuation of the family: "Men are to marry, women are to be given in marriage, all seek to have descendants to continue the sacrifices to the ancestors." From this concern come the social relationships and their appropriate virtues. But, "as for the Buddha, he teaches men not to kill living things, not to eat meat, not to fornicate."[2] Such teachings clearly do not lead to the continuation of sacrifices to ancestors.

The two teachings, however, are complementary: both are true and to be followed, one by those still "within the world" (<u>ju-shih</u> 入世) and the other by those who seek enlightenment. Ta-hui quotes Feng as saying:

> In...generations when [emperors] relied on Confucius' teaching, then the empire was well governed. When they took an opposing course, then disorder resulted. The Way of the Buddha is similar. When one awakens, he transcends the ordinary and enters the sagely sphere; when one is deluded, he revolves in the wheel of life and death.[3]

Buddhism and Confucianism are both held to be true in that both have consequences in their separate realms. The consequence of this "separate

---

1. Feng Ch'i 馮楫 (<u>Tzu</u>, Ch i-ch'uan 濟川) was disciple and Dharma-heir of Ta-hui. See pp. 81-82, fn. 4.

2. <u>P'u Shuo</u>, p. 473b.

3. <u>P'u Shuo</u>, p. 473b.

realm" idea is that Confucian virtues are virtues in the context of the world, while Buddhist virtues are virtues in the context of the transcendent, i.e., only if they lead to enlightenment, or proceed from it.

Buddhism does, however, prescribe norms for behavior in the sphere of household life. The separate realm theory does gloss over the possible differences which might exist between Confucian norms for family and social relationships and Buddhist virtues for householders and kings.

The other of the two traditional ways for treating the problem faces this issue more squarely: here the two teachings are seen to apply to the same realm in such a way as to appear to be fundamentally identical. What is good behavior for a Confucian will earn good karma for the Buddhist householder. This latter is in fact the way that Ta-hui prefers to solve the problem. In the following pages we shall see that Ta-hui accepts explicitly the Confucian virtues, the Confucian definition of good and bad conduct, as being relevant to, and fitting into without modification, the Buddhist understanding of good and evil as formulated in the ideas of karma and rebirth in the ten paths of existence.[1] Good behavior in the five normative relationships, for example, will produce good karma. A filial son will not go to the hells or to an undesirable birth, as we learn from the following passage in reference to a departed son:

> When your son was present [in this world], he did good deeds. He was filial to his father

---

1. See Chapter V, p. 194, fn. 1.

> and mother. After his death he certainly won't have fallen into an evil path [of rebirth].[1]

What is true of the filial son is true of those who have acted well in all the relationships:

> It says in the teaching that if a man is of humble station it is because his bad karma from previous lives brought about his falling into an evil path. By suffering the fate of being of humble station in this life, his bad karma from previous lives is eliminated. But if as a son one is filial to his parents, and as a minister is loyal to his lord, as a superior loves his inferiors, and as an inferior respects his superiors, then what faults [with karmic consequences] can he have? In the future he must certainly be born in a superior place.[2]

Loyalty, another chief virtue appropriate to one of the five normative relationships, receives praise from Ta-hui in the following context:

> Now you see Scholar Ch'eng here, I often call him a lay Bodhisattva. Once in [Ch'in Tsung's] reign he went out to meet the sacred vehicle of the emperor. Now that was a time of great disasters, and of those who went out, few returned with their lives. But he bravely said, "How can one receive an order from one's lord and not go out?" So he went out serenely and returned serenely. I believe that his mind can penetrate Heaven and Earth, and string past and present on one thread. It can compete in brilliance with the sun and the moon.[3]

As a brief epithet epitomizing the conflation of Confucian virtues and the Buddhist understanding of karmic fruits, Ta-hui quotes:

---

1. <u>P'u Shuo</u>, p. 422a.

2. <u>P'u Shuo</u>, p. 422a-b.

3. <u>P'u Shuo</u>, p. 463b.

> If there is no Heaven then that is that. If there is, then the chün-tzu 君子 (Confucian gentleman, true student of the Way who embodies its virtues) will be born there. If there is no hell, that is that. If there is, then the hsiao-jen 小人 (inferior man, the opposite of chün-tzu) will enter it.[1]

B. Similarities in Essence, Differences in Function

The second aspect of Ta-hui's view of the truth of Confucianism is that he clearly believes that Confucianism and Buddhism lead to the same goal, the realization of the same absolute. This conviction is shown by his frequent use of the term "the sages of the Three Teachings." His usage of the term reflects an acceptance of the idea which the phrase assumes, namely that the Three Teachings are all paths to the same ultimate goal, sagehood. The term "sage" had originated in the Confucian tradition, and had early been used not only as a term for the Confucian ideal man but also for the Taoist "True Man" and the Buddhist "Buddha" or "Enlightened One." As we have seen above on p. 121, Hui Tsung, influenced by his preference for Taoism, had challenged the notion of identical accomplishment and status implied by the term in his edict ordering that Buddhists cease to enshrine pictures of "the sages of the Three Teachings" in Buddhist monasteries and temples.

In the Sung Confucian tradition the term "sage" had come to mean an ideal man, one who can at once transcend the limitations of the "human mind" so as to be in touch with the transcendent Tao or Principle

---

1. P'u Shuo, p. 458a.

that governs the universe, and at the same time live a fully immanent life as a link between Heaven and Earth, embodying the virtues of both in the human realm. Ta-hui's use of the term, given his probable knowledge of the Tao-hsüeh conception of sagehood and the mind of the sage, certainly was more than a rote repetition of an ancient usage. It must also have represented to some degree a recognition of the identity of the goals of personal transformation in the three traditions, a recognition made possible also by the Tao-hsüeh description of the mind of the sage as unmoved while penetrating all things,[1] and of the sagely

---

1. A favorite text that established the sage's position as a link between Heaven and Earth was the following passage from the Chung-yüng 中庸 (Doctrine of the Mean):

> "It is only he who is possessed of the most complete sincerity that can exist under heaven, who can give its full development to his nature. Able to give its full development to his own nature, he can do the same to the nature of other men. Able to give its full development to the nature of other men, he can give their full development to the natures of animals and things. Able to give their full development to the natures of creatures and things, he can assist the transforming and nourishing powers of Heaven and Earth. Able to assist the transforming and nourishing powers of Heavens and Earth, he may with Heaven and Earth form a ternion" (James Legge, Confucius: Confucian Analects, The Great Learning and the Doctrine of the Mean [New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1971; reprint of the second revised edition published by Clarendon Press, Oxford, in 1893 as Vol. I of The Chinese Classics], pp. 416-17).

An I Ching text that was particularly influential and frequently quoted in Sung Tao-hsüeh as describing the mind of the sage is the following passage from one of the appendices to the I Ching, the Ta-chuan (Great Treatise):

> "[The mind of the sage] is tranquil and unmoving; but when stimulated, it penetrates all the affairs of the world" (T'ao Tsung-han, ed., I-ching chi-chu,

irtue, jen 仁 (benevolence), as a realization of one's unity with all hings.[1] We shall see below that such is the case.

Another evidence of this belief in a shared goal is Ta-hui's use of he term "Nature" to refer to the absolute held in common by the two raditions. We have seen above that for Ta-hui, as for other Ch'an eachers, the goal of Buddhist practice was insight into one's own Buddha ature, often referred to in abbreviated form as "the Nature."

Ta-hui sees Confucianism also as a path of self-disciplined practice oward a goal of realization of the Nature of all things which is at the ame time one's own Nature. What Confucians refer to as the "Nature" s then in some sense identical to what Buddhists refer to as the "Buddha-lature." Here Ta-hui departs from Ts'ung-mi, who had seen Confucianism s teaching, following the I Ching, the one Ch'i as the fundamental eality.[2]

---

p. 101; cf. Wilhelm/Baynes, p. 315). The subject of the sentence in the original does not seem to be mind of the sage, but Tao-hsüeh scholars gave it that meaning).

. Cf. Ch'eng Hao's "Essay on Knowing Benevolence," where he says, "By enevolence we are one undivided substance with things" (Honan Ch'eng-hih i-shu, Kuo-hsüeh chi-pen ts'ung-shu edition, p. 16; quoted in Graham, . 100). Cf. also Graham (p. 54), where Ch'eng I is quoted as expressing similar view.

. Ta-hui could of course have arrived at this view of Confucian teaching as centering on the realization of the Nature through his own reading f the Confucian classics and of Mencius, but it is far more likely hat he was influenced by his acquaintance with Tao-hsüeh adherents and is consequent knowledge of the Ch'eng brothers' teaching about the identity of the Nature and Principle. Cf. Chapter II above.

For Ta-hui to include Confucianism as a path to truth within his Buddhist framework, it was necessary that there be a common "ultimate" that was the source of wisdom and virtue in both; the term "Nature" was convenient for referring to this "ultimate", having somewhat similar meanings in both traditions. To know one's own Nature was thus in both traditions to become identified with the Nature of all things.

The following passage from Ta-hui's teachings illustrates the usefulness of the term "Nature" to refer to the ultimate source of all goodness that was the object of self-cultivation in both traditions. In it Ta-hui argues that traditions themselves are manifestations, or "functions," of the one Nature. In Chinese thought one "substance" (*t'i* 體) may have different "activities," "manifestations" or "functions" (*yung* 用): thus things which are clearly different in phenomenal manifestation may be one in essence, and two apparently different things may be shown to be the two sides of the essence-manifestation coin:

> Educated men may study the Way of the former kings, and talk of the words of the sages, but if they can't put them to use, there is no reality to their talk. You must know that this "One Great Thing" is not born and is not extinguished, neither comes nor goes, and in the end comes forth from man's wide and great, lonely and silent, wonderful Mind. Before there was the world, there was this Nature, perfect, not moving or changing. But after the division of the original *hun* (混), above there was the lord, below there was the minister. Fathers and children cherished their places, noble and base distinguished their ranks. Even down to the gentleman, farmer, worker and merchant, each followed his fundamental Nature, and received its activity (*yung* 用, function). Therefore the great Earth created and transformed, there was *yin* and *yang*, cold and hot (winter and summer). The illustrious kings governed the world, and there was giving birth and killing, reward and punishment. The Buddha's Law has provisional and real, sudden and gradual. Confucius

> established a teaching in which there was ritual and music. Later students relied on these teachings to guide their practice. If one family followed them, then that one family was carefree. If one state followed them, then that one state was peaceful. This is not something that comes from outside you; it is all each person's own Prajña's profound activity. Furthermore, this activity has no traces. It is like Spring passing among the ten thousand things. Spring originally has no form, but although it does not, nevertheless when you look at the peach trees turning pink and the pear trees covered in white, and the grass and trees flourishing, that is the visible shadow of Spring. If scholar-officials obtain the activity (functioning) of benevolence, righteousness, ritual, wisdom and trustworthiness, they will also again be able to give life to all beings and souls. The knack [which is the gift of real appropriation of the functioning] will appear spontaneously on the tip of their pens, and they will accomplish wonderfully profitable and beneficial things. If monks fulfill the vinaya rules, concentration and wisdom, ...they will be able to become true monks. As for the Taoists, if they practice "obtain one, compassion; two, frugality; three, don't dare put yourself before others,"[1] they can create the Way of non-action. Then they will know that one is all, and all is one. All is the eternal allotment of my mind, it is not artificially created by other means.[2]

is text is one of the most enlightening passages for our study of -hui's views on the relation between the Three Teachings. Note that nfucianism and Buddhism are seen as different forms of the same sence, here referred to as Mind, Nature and Prajña. Virtues in both ths are the functioning of this essence.

Paraphrasing Lao-tzu, Chapter 67, Ssu-pu-pei-yao edition (Taipei: ung Hwa Book Company, 1970; hereafter cited as "Lao-tzu"), chüan 2, . 18b-19a.

P'u Shuo, p. 461b.

The aim of the Buddhist is of course to go beyond the realm of everyday merit-making and actually see into and attain the activity of this Nature, realizing that all is "empty" and miraculously "given" as it is. Ta-hui asserts that such is also the proper aim of the Confucian. To attain virtue requires something akin to enlightenment. It is this insight that frees from life and death for a Confucian as much as for a Buddhist:

> If when scholars and superior men study the Way of the former kings they have no moment of activation of insight, then they aren't able to reach the limit of Principle and exhaust the Nature. You [the senior monk] are of the household of the Buddhist vehicle; if you don't have a moment of glimpsing the Nature, then you will be bound and fettered by words, you won't know how to control yourself. Even in the case of all the different arts of the world, if one doesn't gain something intuitively, then one can't exhaust their mystery. How much more, when one studies the peerless Bodhi, does one need enlightenment to leave the wheel of rebirth in the three worlds behind.[1]

Because all virtue is the functioning of the same essence, it is possible for Ta-hui to say that one who achieves Buddhahood can be a better Confucian than the sage kings, and can perform the Confucian sage's traditional role:

> ...that [enlightenment] is the place where you achieve Buddhahood and become a patriarch, that is when you personally convert hells into heavens, that is the place where you "sit in retirement," that is where you leave life and death behind, that is the place where you yourself are higher

---

1. P'u Shuo, p. 453a.

> than Yao or Shun, that's when you raise up a people with no spirit from their exhaustion, that is when you bestow a gift upon your children and grandchildren.[1]

If one obtains the functioning of Nature or Prajñā in one's conduct, then one is in touch with the essence that is also the source of other virtues:

> "Benevolence" is the benevolence of the Nature, "righteousness" is the righteousness of the Nature, "propriety" is the propriety of the Nature, "wisdom" is the wisdom of the Nature, "trustworthiness" is the trustworthiness of the Nature. The "right" meaning "true" is also the Nature. Doing things lacking truth is opposing the Nature. Doing right things is following the Nature....If you know the place where benevolence, righteousness, ritual, wisdom and trustworthiness arise in the Nature, then "examining things," "loyalty and reciprocity," "one common thread," all are within it.[2]

Ta-hui asserts that the aim and accomplishment of the two teachings are not two different things:

> The great Tripiṭaka that Śākyamuni preached is only a prescription to cure the sickness of the minds of the myriad beings. The nine classics and the seventeen histories are also only prescriptions to cure the mind. The world and that outside the world in the beginning were not two.[3]

Again:

> If you reach this moment [of awakening], then for the first time you will see that all the teachings of the Tripiṭaka, and all the words said by the

---

1. Letters, pp. 103-105.

2. Letters, pp. 148-50.

3. P'u Shuo, p. 468b.

> sages of the Three Teachings are in the end but things within your own room, they are nothing to do with anyone else, and speak only of this moment of enlightenment.[1]

Herein lies the heart of the matter for Ta-hui, the crucial reason why he believes that "the Three Teachings return to one." Ta-hui might, as did other Buddhists, have relegated Confucianism as a social-ethical system to the realm of provisional, mundane reality and have claimed that only Buddhism was a path beyond the world to transcendence. I suspect that one reason he avoided this obvious alternative was that in enlightenment he "understood" the words of the Confucian sages for the first time in a new way and concluded that the sages understood something akin to what he had realized in enlightenment. Ta-hui believed that Confucius and Mencius also had this direct insight that enabled them to "reach the limit of Principle and exhaust the Nature." For example, observe how Mencius is quoted by Ta-hui in the following passages:

> When the Buddha had just been born, he pointed to Heaven with one hand and to Earth with the other and said, "Above the Heavens and under the Heavens, I alone am worthy of honor." Therefore it is said that in the three worlds the only respected one is called "I." This "I" is not the "I" of "others and I." It is as Mencius said: "The ten thousand things are complete in me."[2]

---

1. P'u Shuo, p. 410b.

2. P'u Shuo, p. 466a. Hsieh Ping-ying et al., Hsin-i ssu-shu tu-pen, p. 477; cf. also James Legge, The Works of Mencius, Bk. VII, Pt. I, Ch. IV, Sec. 1, pp. 450-51.

> Mencius also said, "The chün-tzu (superior man) wishes to obtain it in himself. When he obtains it in himself, then he abides in it securely. Abiding in it securely, he relies on it deeply. Relying on it deeply, he 'seizes it on the left and right,' encountering it everywhere as a source [from which things flow]."[1] At this time the Buddha's Dharma had not yet reached [China], yet even at that early date someone said something like this.[2]

Everything needful is already provided in the Confucian tradition: "Scholar-officials when studying the Way of the former Sages have only to rectify their minds and abide in the Mean."[3] But most Confucians have forgotten this epistemological dimension:

> Earlier when I was discussing with the scholar-magistrate about the sages of the Three Teachings, Śakyamuni, Confucius and Li Lao [Lao-tzu], I said, "They see with one eye, they hear with one ear, they smell with one nose, they taste with one tongue, they touch with one body, they think with one mind." I also said, "In our teaching there are two ways of understanding. There is the direct, intuitive way of understanding without making distinctions, and there is the comparative way, in which one reasons from one point to another in order to understand the hundred dharmas. All of the sūtras and śastras record this." The magistrate said, "I observe that these days scholar-officials dispense with Confucius' realm of direct understanding, and walk in [the realm of] comparative understanding." I said: "Your words are all too true."[4]

---

1. Cf. Hsieh Ping-ying et al., ed., Hsin-i ssu-shu tu-pen, p. 388; and Legge, The Works of Mencius, Bk. IV, Pt. II, Ch. XIV, pp. 322-23. In quoting this passage Ta-hui omits the third through the seventh characters.

2. P'u Shuo, p. 451a; a parallel appears also in P'u Shuo, p. 410b.

3. P'u Shuo, p. 473b.

4. P'u Shuo, p. 473a-b.

For a person who has not experienced an intuitive insight similar to that of the Buddhist or Confucian sages, to evaluate the differences between Confucianism and Buddhism according to their forms is dangerous:

> Once you have succeeded in understanding the teachings of this school, then you will know that the laws taught by the sages of the Three Teachings are different roads that lead to the same place. Today's ordinary men look at appearances, they come out of different doors and call one another good and evil. Taoists, not believing in the Buddha, say that Buddhism is annihilation. The disciples of the Buddha don't admit [that there is truth in] Taoist teaching. When there is this attitude, a competitive debate ensues. Where there is competitive debate, the Way has been departed from. Why? In the Way there originally is no conflict.[1]

But while Ta-hui firmly believes that the "Three Teachings return to one," he also is interested in preserving the differences between Confucianism and Buddhism. To talk of similarities, he says, is also dangerous: facile reconcilation, such as one which was imparted to him by one of his scholar-official acquaintances,[2] results in misunderstanding

---

1. P'u Shuo, p. 461a.

2. Letters, pp. 88-90. In a letter to Liu Tzu-yü, Ta-hui refers at length to the facile attempt of Liu's younger brother Tzu-hui to equate the meaning of a line from one of the appendices to the I Ching, the Ta-chuan (Great Treatise):

> "[The] Tao [of the Changes] is forever changing--alteration, movement without rest" (T'ao Tsung-han, ed, I-ching chi-chu, p. 112; Wilhelm/Baynes, I Ching, p. 348. I have used the Wilhelm/Baynes translation)

with the meaning of the famous line from the Diamond sūtra:

> "Responding to where there is no place to abide give birth to this mind" (Taishō 8, p. 749c; Edward Conze, Buddhist Wisdom Books [London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1958] translates this passage on pp. 47-48 in quite a different manner).

oth Buddha and Confucius, obscuring both the real differences in con-
eptualizat..n and the real truths of each. Apparently parallel state-
ents must not be taken to mean the same thing when they actually do not.

Rather than easily collapsing two different things into each other nd identifying them unjustifiably, Ta-hui prefers that the scholars do hat he calls "showing how the two are in harmony." What he means by hat is illustrated by the following example he takes from Ts'ung-mi:

> Ts'ung-mi said, "Beginning, penetrating, harmonizing and correcting are the virtues of the hexagram Ch'ien [the first hexagram of the I Ching, representing Heaven], and they begin with one Ether (Ch'i). Permanence, joy, selfhood and purity [the characteristics of Nirvāṇa given in the Nirvāna sūtra] are the virtues of Buddhism, and their root is in the One Mind. If you concentrate the one Ether you can achieve perfect softness, if you cultivate the One Mind you can achieve the Way." That old monk's way of harmonizing the two teachings is without prejudice and does not leave a legacy of resentment.[1]

We have seen above that Ts'ung-mi in one of his commentaries on the Sūtra of Perfect Enlightenment drew out at some length the parallel hat Ta-hui summarizes here. Ts'ung-mi did not state as a conclusion that the terms "one Ch'i" and "One Mind" refer to the same reality, or

---

Ta-hui says that these equations are ridiculous, for the two passages are naking entirely different points. The point of the passage from the Diamond sūtra is to teach that Mind has no "real substance," i.e., it is empty, but that the place of its establishment does not depart from the real. The point of the I Ching passage is to teach that good and bad fortune are the result of motion and change, and that one must return to the constant principle by conforming to the Way. Thus Liu Tzu-hui's seeing an identical meaning in these two passages only proves to Ta-hui that he understands neither the teaching of Confucius nor that of Śākyamuni.

1. Letters, p. 90.

that the results of self-cultivation in the two schools were the same. His approach was rather to clarify remarkable parallels while showing differences as well: one could hardly argue that "selfhood, purity, joy and permanence" are identical to "beginning, penetrating, harmonizing and correcting." Clearly Tsung-mi believed that there was enough essential similarity to allow him to conclude in his Yüan-jen lun that both teachings are true, but that only in Buddhism, and in fact only in one school of Buddhism, does one find the teaching which is not merely provisional (chüan) but which expresses the final truth. But he does not allow such similarity to tempt him to forget or obscure differences.

What Ta-hui then appears to mean by "harmonizing" is clarifying the proper natures of each teaching, and the sense in which it is true, and then setting them in their proper places in relation to each other on a larger map of useful teachings of the universe, a map on which each has its meaning and all are related by the fact that all can be understood as coming from and pointing to a larger cosmic order. This notion relates to Ta-hui's understanding that Buddhism, Confucianism and Taoism are all functions of the same Nature, the same Principle, but have very different functions. A Confucian who, through realizing the Nature in himself, obtains the activity (functioning) of the Confucian virtues of benevolence, righteousness, propriety, wisdom and trustworthiness, and is thereby able to give life to all things, does not become a Buddhist in the way he expresses his realization. Rather, by following his Nature as a Confucian he obtains the active power and function appropriate to the Confucians, and thus may achieve the Confucian's telos, transforming the world by governing it. Buddhist monks likewise fulfill the aims

their practice by following the Nature, but they do not therefore become Confucians; they become good monks. Diversity is characteristic of that creative activity of the Nature that has brought forth all things. The Confucian social and moral order is a major constituent part of that which has been created; so also is the Buddha's Law in its various adaptations to the world.

Ta-hui does not believe, however, that a good Confucian cannot also simultaneously be a good Buddhist. The Nature, the Mind, contains all: "all is the eternal allotment of my Mind:"[1] the Mind, the source of all, cannot be limited by these temporal distinctions. "The Mind of Enlightenment is also the mind of loyalty and righteousness."[2] But still the differences are preserved.

The following passage gives another different version of the cosmology or cosmic map which Ta-hui sees as harmonizing the functions of the different traditions. This is a passage taken from the Pao-tsang lun 寶藏論, a T'ang work attributed to the early Chinese exponent of Mādhyamika Buddhist thought, Seng Chao 僧肇 (374-414):

> The emptiness which can be emptied is not the real emptiness. The form (se 色, rūpa) that can be formed is not the real form. The real form has no shape (hsing 形) the real emptiness has no name. That with no name is the father of names; that with no form is the mother of forms. It is the root and

---

1. P'u Shuo, p. 471b.

2. Yü-lu, Taishō 47, p. 912c.

source of the ten thousand things, it is the Ancestor of Heaven and Earth.[1] Above it reaches the heavenly bodies (hsüan hsiang 玄象), below it can be ranked with Hades (ming t'ing 冥庭). The original Ether is included within the T'ai Hsiang 大象 (the "great symbol"), the T'ai Hsiang is hidden in the Formless (wu-hsing 無形). It is the Soul (ling 靈) that knows things. Within that soul there is the Spirit (shen 神), and within that Spirit there is the body.[2] Non-action and changes are based on Spontaneous Nature (tzu-jan 自然). Subtly there are functions, gradually there are form (hsing 形) and name. When form began there was yet no material substance, name arose when there were not yet names. When form and name appeared, the moving Ether confused the clear. Quiet! Alone![3] Broad! Wide! Separate! Distinct! Above there is the lord, below there is the minister. Father and son were close in their dwellings, noble and base took different ranks. Those who began the teaching distinguished the original causes, and afterward the states separated their borders. Men took care of their families, and each kept his place. Ritual and righteousness flourished in practice, and there was goodness that could be talked about and evil that could

---

1. This passage seems to imitate Lao-tzu, Chapter 1, which reads:

> "The Tao that can be told of is not the eternal Tao;
> The name that can be named is not the eternal name.
> The Nameless is the origin of Heaven and Earth
> The Named is the mother of all things" (Lao-tzu, chüan 1, p. 1a; Chan, The Way of Lao Tzu (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1963), p. 97.

2. Ts'ung-mi in his Ta-fang-kuan yüan-chüeh ching lueh-ch'ao, chüan 1, quotes the passage beginning with "The original Ether" and ending with "body." He attributes it to Seng Chao (374-414) (Zokuzōkyō, 1, 15, 2, p. 91b). Ta-hui's version differs from Ts'ung-mi's in one respect: where Ta-hui has "the Formless (wu-hsing)," Ts'ung-mi has "Perfect Form (yüan-hsing 圓形)."

3. Cf. Lao-tzu, Chapter 25, chüan 1, p. 13b, where we find chi hsi liao hsi 寂兮寥兮. Cf. also Lao-tzu, Chapter 21, chüan 1, pp. 11b-12a, where we find a parallel structure with different vocabulary.

> be named. The good was what people esteemed, the evil was what they despised.[1]

-hui then says:

> The ancients had a name for this; they called it "broadly throwing light upon the empty and the existing."[2]

This etiological and cosmological myth includes elements drawn from
ao-tzu and the I Ching. But note how when the world is created, what s created is the Confucian world order and the Confucian categories for nderstanding social experience. Confucianism and Buddhism and their ifferences all have a status in the world that is provisional in the ense that they are manifestations of Nature or Principle, and not Nature r Principle itself, a status that in Buddhist terms must be described s "empty," but nonetheless a real status in that they were the forms hat the formless brought forth, the forms that give order to the "ten housand things."

For Ta-hui the realization that the relationship of the "Three eachings" is that of identity in difference can thus be expressed hrough the metaphor of one substance or essence with many activities. t can also be expressed through the metaphor of the Formless being able o take three different forms, or through the metaphor of the Ultimate rinciple or Nature as the source of different provisional manifestations. These metaphors express a paradox that can only be truly understood through an insight gained in a religious experience of the essence of

---

1. P'u Shuo, p. 414a-b. This passage appears in the Pao-tsang lun, hapter 1, Zokuzōkyō 2, 1, 1, p. 23b. Ta-hui elsewhere attributes the assage beginning "Quiet! Alone!" through "men take care of their families..." to Seng Chao. (P'u Shuo, p. 466b).

2. P'u Shuo, p. 414b.

the Nature itself. Such insight is available to members of all three traditions; all three traditions are in fact the products of such insight in their founders and shapers. Such insight is to be gained only by intuition, never by thought. Thought, since it deals with "names and forms," becomes ensnared by names and forms, and is never able to see the unity of the formless behind the forms, the unity of the Nature underlying different functions, Ta-hui says:

> If you say they [Confucian and Buddhist teachings] are the same, that won't do. If you say they are not the same, then that is more accurate. For they are the same in principle but different in manifestation.[1]

C. Truth and Error in Taoism.

Ta-hui also offers his disciples some specific guidance on how to respond to the teaching of the Taoists. He deals with Taoism on two levels. The first is that of Taoist teachings that come directly from the *Lao-tzu* or the *Chuang-tzu*. Of these Ta-hui speaks approvingly as representing true wisdom. "*Wu-wei*" or "non-action"[2] is for Ta-hui the core of Taoism. The "three treasures" of Lao-tzu are the same as the Three Treasures (*tri-ratna*) of Buddhist teaching:

---

1. *P'u Shuo*, p. 473b.

2. Cf. *Lao-tzu*, Chapters 37, 47 and 49 *chüan* 1, pp. 21a; *chüan* 2, pp. 7a-8a, and *Chuang-tzu*, Ssu-pu pei yao edition (Taipei: Chung Hwa Book Company, 1973), Chapter 22, section 1, *chüan* 7, pp. 22a-23b.

The T'ang emperor Jui Tsung 睿宗 [1] invited Ssu-ma Tzu-wei 司馬子微 [2] to come to the capital, and asked him, "I know you have a number of techniques; can you explain them to me?" He replied, "The Way is to lose and lose again until you reach non-action.[3] How would it be permissible to labor on the form and study 'a number of techniques'?" The emperor said: "Non-action would be possible for ordering the life of the individual body, but what about a state?" Ssu-ma answered: "A state is composed of individuals. If you only follow the course of things, then [you] naturally will have nothing to think about, and the empire will be in order." The emperor was greatly pleased. Ssu-ma Tzu-wei was only a Taoist, but when we look at his reply, we can say that he had profound knowledge and far-reaching vision. How can you talk on the same day of "a number of techniques" for cultivating fame and profit?[4]

Our teaching has the Three Treasures: Buddha, Dharma and Sangha. Lao-tzu also taught three treasures. One is called deep love, the second is called frugality, and the third is called "not daring to precede anyone in the empire."[5] Although the words are different, the meaning is the same.[6]

---

1. Jui Tsung reigned from 710-713.

2. Ssu-ma Ch'eng-chen 司馬承禎 (T. Tzu-wei) was a Taoist recluse whose dates of birth and death are unknown. He is known to have lived by imperial command in the Wang-wu Mountain in modern Shansi Province during the K'ai-yüan period (713-41). Cf. Morohashi, Dai Kanwa jiten, no. 3257.388, vol. 2, p. 787; and Chu Hsi and Lü Tsu-ch'ien, eds. (Wing-tsit Chan, trans.), Reflections on Things at Hand, p. 130, note 31.

3. Cf. Lao-tzu, Chapter 48, chüan 2, pp. 7b-8a.

4. P'u Shuo, p. 461a.

5. Cf. Lao-tzu, Chapter 67, chüan 2, pp. 18b-19a. Chan also translates tz'u as "deep love" (The Way of Lao Tzu, pp. 219-20).

6. P'u Shuo, p. 461a.

These Taoist expressions of truth support Ta-hui's idea that the sages of the Three Teachings speak with one voice. The original passage in Lao-tzu from which Ta-hui takes these lines is open to various interpretations. Ta-hui here interprets it in such a way as to point to similarities between the Taoist teaching of compassion or deep love, the Buddha's teaching of compassion and Confucius' teaching of "benevolence"; and between the Taoist teaching of frugality, control of desires and humility, and the Buddhist teaching and practice of non-attachment and the end of egotism.

A second level of Taoist activity, however, draws Ta-hui's criticism. This is the Taoist search for immortality through various techniques and disciplines. For example, he says:

> Now these days there is one kind of man who wants to seek to become a god, or an immortal who enjoys a long life and does not die. But what is it that enjoys long life and does not die? It is not that there are no gods and immortals; [there are men who] have achieved enough in their practice to become gods and immortals and depart. For instance, [we all know that] Lü Tung-pin 呂洞賓 came to study under the monk Huang-lung Lao-chi 黄龍老機 ---can we say that there are no immortals?[1] But if you reach the point of "real emptiness, miraculous being," then you'll know that there is no life that can be extinguished....[Buddhahood] is the eternal property of my own Mind, it is not the temporary creation of other arts.[2]

---

1. Lü Tung-pin is a famous Taoist immortal. Accounts of Huang-lung Hui chi 黄龍晦機 are given in Tao-yüan, Ching-te ch'uan-teng-lu, (Taipei: Chen shan mei Ch'u-pan-she, 1967), chüan 23, pp. 53-54; and in Hsü Ju-chi, Chih-yüeh lu (Taipei: Chen-shan-mei Ch'u-pan-she, 1959), chüan 21, pp. 7b-8b (vol. 3, pp. 1432-34). I have been unable to trace the story of the meeting to which Ta-hui refers.

2. P'u Shuo, p. 471b; cf. also Letters, pp. 161-62.

For Ta-hui the search for immortality must represent a failure to derstand that death and life are "empty". The search for immortality y succeed on its own terms, but it fails to realize that there is no fe that could be extinguished, that no one has ever died. What is n by these skillfull arts is not the highest enlightenment: enlighten- nt is the permanent endowment of our own Mind. Further, although oists who win control of their bodies are powerful, Buddhists who ide in Prajñā are more powerful. They have mastered Mind, and at the pproach of death can triumph over karmic causality and escape samsara:

> The Taoists who preserve their thoughts within the deluded mind are able to succeed as days and months go by in not being controlled by the material elements (earth, water, fire, air, wood). How much more will you, if you rest your thought completely in Prajñā, be able at the approach of death to turn force of karma?[1]

Moreover, as we have seen above, Ta-hui believes that the Taoists' earch for immortality is not on the same high plane as the insight eflected in the formula "wu-wei" or "non-action." The one seeks one's wn profit, while the other is exactly the principle of transcending he idea of profit and loss.

Ta-hui here argues against the belief and practice of another group ecause they do not accord with the aspirations and experience of his wn. His criticism of Taoist practice is softened, however, by the act that he argues that that in the Taoist tradition which he sees as he product of inferior insight does not accord with the highest insights

---

. Letters, pp. 161-62.

of the very Taoist tradition in which it is practiced. Thus it is possible to object to certain Taoist practices while assuring laymen that "the Three Teachings return to one."

It is noteworthy that Ta-hui is sharply critical of Taoist error where it most resembles his own truth, namely, in the areas of meditation practice and the theoretical understanding that forms its foundation. This is the realm in which mistakes by Taoists could conflict with or pervert orthodox Buddhist understandings.

D. Ta-hui's Lay Disciples and the Three Teachings.

How many of Ta-hui's lay disciples would have accepted his view that Confucian, Taoist and Buddhist teachings depend on one truth? A full answer to this question would require a closer reading of all the surviving works of Ta-hui's lay students, a task beyond the scope of this preliminary study. Within the limited material recorded in the Sung-shih, the Sung-Yüan hsueh-an and the Sung-Yüan hsueh-an p'u-i, biographical works which show scant interest in the Buddhist-related activities of their subjects, we do find a few clues: these occur in biographies of five of the eleven of Ta-hui's lay students most active in scholarly fields or teaching. These clues indicate a considerable range of opinion on the question of whether Buddhism and Confucianism refer to the same truth.

In the case of Li Kuang we find only a very minor clue. Li Kuang remarks that the I Ching, in which he was particularly interested, is

s profound on the subject of cause and effect and change as all of the uddhist sutras.[1]

The case of Liu Tzu-hui, an early teacher of Chu Hsi, is more comlex. He is reported as saying of himself.

> I listened to the Buddhists and thought their words correct, and then I read our own [Confucian] books, and discovered the completeness of the essence and functioning of our Way. Its elevated tone and far-reaching knowledge---how can they be equalled? So I wrote a book treating the transmission from Yao and Shun...to Mencius, discussing the Way they practiced, and introducing the truth they passed down.[2]

e also says: "I entered the Way through the I Ching."[3]

These passages might appear to suggest that Liu Tzu-hui left uddhism behind. But Chu Hsi, who as a student of Liu's was in a posiion to know, said that when Liu studied Confucian books he thought hat they harmonized with the Buddhist teaching, and that it was for his reason that Liu wrote the Sheng-ch'uan lun, or the Treatise on the ransmission of the Sages, the work Liu refers to in the above passage.[4]

Chu Hsi's suggestion seems borne out by a reading of the Shengh'uan lun.[5] In this work we find an understanding of the Confucian Way

---

. SYHAPI, chüan 20, p. 9a-b.

. SYHAPI, chüan 43, p. 12b.

. SYHA, chüan 43, p. 5a (I, p. 671). Liu Tzu-hui is also called Liu zu-yün 劉子翬.

. Chu-tzu yü lei, quoted in SYHAPI, chüan 43, p. 12a.

. Included in SYHAPI, chüan 43, pp. 4a-9a.

greatly informed by Buddhist and Taoist emphases upon Mind, egolessness and no-thought as the essences of the Way.

An implied negative judgment of Ta-hui's position is found in the biographies of Wang Ying-ch'en.[1] Wang is said to have split with his teachers Lü Pen-chung and Chang Chiu-ch'eng because of their faith in Buddhism. He himself is thought by later Confucian historians never to have believed in Buddhism.[2]

Lü Pen-chung and Chang Chiu-ch'eng are the two of Ta-hui's lay students who have left much evidence of considerable sympathy with Ta-hui's position. In the material recorded with the biographies of Lü Pen-chung we find striking parallels to the teaching of Ta-hui. In Sung-Yüan hsüeh-an p'u-i, chüan 36, we find a short essay on Buddhism and Confucianism by Lü Pen-chung. Below is a partial translation:

> Is the Buddha's teaching different from [that of] Confucius? No. How do we know it is not different? We know by [comparing the two] teachings. Confucius taught "First know to stop and then have fixity, have fixity and then have quiet, have quiet and then have peace, have peace and then deliberate, deliberate and then obtain...."[3] Now the Buddha teaches that vinaya precepts give rise to samādhi. From samādhi wisdom [Prajña] is produced. This is no different from what is said in The Great Learning.

---

1. SYHA, chüan 46, p. 3b (I, p. 696).

2. SYHA, chüan 46, p. 3b (I, p. 696).

3. This is of course the second sentence of the Ta-hsüeh 大學 (The Great Learning); cf. Legge, Confucius, p. 356.

> Mencius said: "The ten thousand things are all complete in me. To reflect upon oneself and (become) sincere is the greatest joy." A Buddhist said, "Heaven and Earth and the ten thousand things are all seen by my Mind. Mountains and rivers and the great Earth are all the possessions of my body." This is exactly the same as what Mencius said. It is because of these [parallels] in the teachings that I know that the Buddha's teaching is not different from that of Confucius....
>
> The points at which they [the two teachings] differ are merely traces. Although they are traces where do they come from? One can't know the reality of this unless one silently knows Mind and has penetrated to this point.[1] Otherwise one relies on words and language; without grasping the root one wants to decide whether the fruits are the same or different...Students can only know correctly [about the identity or difference of Buddhism and Confucianism] if they obtain without thinking, complete without acting, go from thought to no thought, from action to non-action. Those who desire the Good must not hurry.[2]

ι another passage it is reported that Lü Pen-chung said:

> Literary composition requires an entrance through [a moment of] enlightenment (wu 悟). Enlightenment must come through effort (kung-fu 工夫).[3]

This reminds one of Ta-hui's similar statement (cf. p. above) in onnection with his belief that the necessity of enlightenment (a moment f intuitive breakthrough) even in worldly skills like writing is evidence f its necessity in the practice of the Way.

. Note the similarity to the view expressed by his teacher Yu Tso in letter to Lü (cf. p. 131 above).

. SYHAPI, chüan 36, pp. 2b-3b.

. SYHAPI, chüan 36, p. 6a.

Evaluation and Conclusion.

How adequate is Ta-hui's understanding of the religious dimension f the Confucian tradition, and how can we evaluate his procedures for rriving at it?

First, Ta-hui did face squarely the dilemma of there being three eparate traditions all making claim to insight into truth. He wanted o evaluate and acknowledge these claims, and his response was to seek imilarities, relations, unities, among the symbols from the three raditions. He did not, however, make an effort to think objectively bout the phenomena of other traditions, nor about what their symbols ight mean to their adherents. He rather used his own understanding of he meaning of Confucian and Taoist symbols as the sole reference point. e ignored half of the Confucian tradition in order to stress the truth f the other half, and never gave the practitioners of Taoist "techniques" chance to speak for themselves. From the point of view of the modern istorian or phenomenologist of religion, Ta-hui's approach is suspect.

It would be fairer to Ta-hui to think of him not as a phenomenologist f religion but as a theologian, a person whose job it is to determine ow his own tradition can respond to the truth claims of others. As a eligious man he based his understanding of the meaning of Confucian nd Taoist classics on his own experiential religious insight. It was his insight that enabled him to read the writings of religious persons rom Confucian and Taoist traditions with understanding of the religious eaning of their expressions. He leaped, of course, to the conclusion hat what Mencius' words meant to Ta-hui must be close to what they meant o Mencius himself, a dangerous conclusion. Furthermore, the reliance on

his own experience as the means to understand the experience of others through its expressions led Ta-hui to be blind to possible religious meanings not consonant with his own experience.

Such a leap to the identification of similarities in expression that indicate similarities in experience and suggest identities in its referent is only possible because Ta-hui can find parallels in the aims and the methods of the three traditions. All three could be seen as paths to involvement in the experiential process of inner transformation. All three were in some sense guiding an individual to the experiential realization of the truth that his own Nature was identical with the true and good order of all things. Thus it was natural to assume that one's own experience on such a path, and one's own realization of such a goal, would be a guide to the understanding of the similar path and goal of others.

Furthermore, Ta-hui would no doubt argue that although one's own religious insight might, as a basis for understanding the religious meaning of the symbols of others, leave one half insightful and half blind, there is no alternative, for the forms of others refer to the formless truth. If we ourselves do not rely on our own insight into the formless truth when reading the expressions of others, we will see only the external forms and become ensnared and confused by them. If we do not rely on our own insights, how can we evaluate the insight of others into the formless truth? We will never see beyond apparent differences in names and forms, and remain on the level of externals.

To express the unity he finds underlying the symbols of the three traditions, Ta-hui is compelled to adopt symbols that are neither merely Buddhist nor merely Confucian, such as "Nature," the "formless," "sage," "Principle," "Tao." These symbols are needed because of their high level of generality and abstraction, and the fact that their metaphors commit one to as little as possible of the specific content of one definite tradition. Symbols such as these may unify meaning across the three teachings without contradicting or interfering with the more specific and concrete symbols of each tradition. But the result of using such symbols as a kind of meta-symbolism for the ultimate is possibly that one will come to emphasize these symbols at the expense of the more concrete metaphorical symbols proper to the three traditions. Another possibility is that he will create a higher-order level of explanatory language to relate the more specific concrete symbols to one another. In this explanatory level "rational" or "conceptual" symbols may predominate, for they will seem needed to explain the relation between non-rational symbols. Universal symbols are needed to unify particular symbols, and universal symbols need some quality of rationality to substantiate their claim to universality. Karma, for example, is a symbol with a high degree of rationality and universality: thus it can relate and "explain" many other particular symbols.

Similarly, in Ta-hui's thought we find a particular emphasis on employing what for convenience we will call "substratum symbols." Substratum symbols are those that refer to the general, the universal, the essence or principle that underlies a variety of manifestations.

Such substratum symbols are required if unifying or relating is to take place across symbol systems, for unifying symbols must be multivalent and vague, protean; they must be metaphors which can refer to many kinds of power, many kinds of relationship. This need for substratum symbols may bring about changes in the meaning of symbols not originally of the substratum kind. For example, in Chinese Buddhism "emptiness," in origin not a "substratum" notion, becomes one in chime with the Taoist "non-being."

Another related possibility, which Ta-hui does not entirely avoid, is to insist, as one tries to bridge the gap between symbols of different traditions, that one's own symbols are the ones according to which the others are most properly understood. Ta-hui has a tendency to see enlightenment (wu) in all meaningful kinds of Confucian religious experience, even in all kinds of intuitive understanding involved in worldly undertakings. This on the one hand is a genuine insight; on the other hand it is a possible case of symbolic imperialism.

Ta-hui's ability to live with three distinct faiths and yet believe them all true lies in a willingness to ignore differences of phenomenal detail. One frequently observes that in Chinese eclectic thought, a thinker, having correlated or unified certain basic things through universal symbols, could leave much of the detail unharmonized as "different paths of self-cultivation" or as different manifestations of the Tao. No one insisted that all be harmonized, only the central insights and aspirations. Furthermore, there were two ultimate referents: did the insight further the orderly government of society, and did the insight accord with experience of the heart? Society demanded orthodoxy, a unified system, with crevices left unwillingly for heterodoxy. But the heart

did not require rational systematic reconcilations: two beliefs or practices might seem unrelated or contradictory, but as long as both seemed true, that was enough. Ta-hui himself reflects this: he claimed that the three roads returned to the same point, that the sages all saw with the same eye, and did not bother to explore differences in detail. The central insights of all three were so convincingly on the same target, that the rest could only be variations in the one pattern.

There can be no doubt that Ta-hui was forced to address himself to the question of the similarities and differences among the Three Teachings because of his desire to encourage laymen to practice the Ch'an path to enlightenment. Confucianism was an inescapable and important part of Sung culture, providing norms and models for behavior in family and society. It was the prism through which history was written. Its classics and histories were the primary curriculum on which all education was based. Scholar-officials saw the world and all their activities in it through Confucian concepts; their puns, allusions, turns of phrase, apt quotations, all reflected the Confucian lore in which they had been steeped; and their judgments reflected its values. A scholar-official who participated in Buddhist ritual or took an interest in the reading of Buddhist literature or the practice of Ch'an could not help confronting the question of how these were to be reconciled with the fundamental presuppositions of the Confucian fabric of his culture. Further, in his activities as statesman and policy-maker, he was often forced to confront the question of the proper attitude of the state toward "the Three Teachings." Ta-hui could not direct his efforts toward the teaching of Buddhism

to laymen without forming an approach of his own toward the Confucian and Taoist traditions.

The same necessity had been faced in the past by Tsung-mi, and in the more recent past by Ch'i-sung and Ch'ang Shang-ying, among others. Why was Ta-hui able to take a more positive attitude than these predecessors had toward the teachings, the practice, the goals and attainments of Confucians and Taoists? One reason, of course, is that his major interest was not in comparing the philosophies of the Three Teachings, as Tsung-mi had done. In so far as he was interested in doing so, he accepted Tsung-mi's approach and conclusions: even though the teachings displayed real differences, remarkable parallels existed in concept and practice that it would be foolish to overlook. Yet he went beyond any of his Buddhist predecessors in asserting the fundamental truth, variously called Tao, the Nature, Buddha-Nature, Principle, One Mind, was the same in the teaching and experience of each tradition. So also was the "enlightenment" or "rectification of the mind" that enabled one to have insight into and act in accord with this Nature or Tao. The enlightened person understands, as no unenlightened person can properly understand, that the teachings of the sages of the three traditions refer to the same Tao. Not only that, but in all of the three traditions the important core of practice is to be enlightened to the One Mind, after which every variety of conduct, judgment, feeling, perception and motivation taught in any of the Three Teachings will spontaneously be achieved. To Ta-hui the notion that the Three Teachings were founded on the same ethical

principles was self-evident and, though occasionally mentioned, not the central issue. What was of crucial importance was that enlightenment was the foundation of true Confucian practice just as it was of true Ch'an practice, and the enlightened Mind of the sage was the object of all Three Teachings.

One major reason for Ta-hui's adopting this position was no doubt his reading of the Confucian and Taoist classics and finding the Tao of his Buddhist experience pointed to, as he thought, in those works. But another reason must have been the new emphasis on experience, on the mind of the sage, which appeared in Sung Confucianism, and particularly in the thinking of the Tao-hsüeh Confucians who were becoming influential in the early Southern Sung. The fact that men such as Yang Shih and Hsieh Liang-tso, Chang Chiu-ch'eng and Lü Pen-chung were willing to find confirmation of and inspiration for their experience in both Buddhist and Taoist as well as Confucian teachings must have confirmed, and perhaps even inspired, Ta-hui's impression that the sages of the Three Teachings "speak with one voice." There must have been a great deal of mutual influence between Ta-hui, who was doing much to make Ch'an popular among Confucian scholar-officials, and his Tao-hsüeh Confucian students who were discovering new ways of interpreting their experience by giving fresh meaning to the language of the Confucian classics.

If Ta-hui had not been concerned to encourage and assist lay practice toward enlightenment, he need never have dealt with the issue. If the Tao-hsueh Sung Confucian movement had never come into being, it is

oubtful that many Buddhists such as Ta-hui would ever have found imilarity or identity at the heart of the Three Teachings.

Chapter V: Ta-hui and the Institutionalization of the Teaching of Laymen in Sung Ch'an

In this chapter we will explore one particular contribution Ta-hui made to Sung Ch'an practice as it relates to laymen: his development of the sermon form known as P'u Shuo 普說. I have chosen this form and its use as one particular contribution of Ta-hui on which to focus attention because it illustrates how Ta-hui's concern for the religious life and the enlightenment of laymen affected both the form and the content of his teaching.

Further, Ta-hui's development of P'u Shuo has a larger significance. The fact that there were P'u Shuo sermons such as Ta-hui's in Ch'an monasteries suggests the existence of a new relationship between the layman and the monastery and its discipline, and between the layman and the Ch'an teacher. We can see five logically distinct steps in the development of these new relationships. First, laymen could relate to teachers as "students outside the walls" on a one-to-one basis. We find this kind of relationship of layman to Ch'an teacher throughout early Ch'an literature from the T'ang dynasty. Second, a layman could be allowed to sponsor for the sake of earning merit events that would take place in the monastery whether he sponsored them or not, and that were unconnected with his own life in any specific way. This would include sponsoring talks on the Dharma to the monks, or offering meals. This kind of relationship would reflect the view that the practice of a layman, as distinct from that of a monk, consisted primarily in performing meritorious acts for the sake of his future happiness or

that of his loved ones. Third, the layman could ask that meritorious acts be performed on occasions other than the ususal monastic occasions, as for example in a cycle of memorial offerings to earn merit for his deceased relatives or friends. The performing of the act was done specifically to meet his needs, but the content of the sermon or sūtra reading need not do so; it appears that before Ta-hui's time and even afterward sermons on such occasions might mention directly neither the layman, the deceased, death or grief. Fourth, the layman could join with other laymen to form a society for performing acts of merit and for studying the Dharma. The society would function under the aegis of the monastery and its teacher. Here the layman might begin to require that his needs as a layman, that is, as a person still living in the world, be addressed by the monastic institution. In the Ch'an school this development apparently began to take place in the Northern Sung dynasty shortly before Ta-hui's time.[1]

What we find with Ta-hui is a fifth step, namely addressing the needs of the layman sponsor directly in the content of the sermon. This was a sign of a new monastic concern for and involvement in lay life, a new relationship clearly actively sought out by Ta-hui himself. Thus Ta-hui's expansion of the P'u Shuo form and his new use for it in teaching laymen can be seen as reflecting a new approach to the teaching of laymen. Not only did Ta-hui reject the traditional approach that

1. Cf. Abe Jōichi, Chūgoku Zenshū shi no kenkyū (Tokyo: Seishin Shobo, 1963), especially pp. 237-239, and 406-409.

sought to distinguish between monks and laymen by teaching monks practice and wisdom leading to enlightenment, while teaching laymen only about the truth of karma and the importance of merit; he also went beyond to the Ch'an practice of teaching selected individual lay students about emptiness and enlightenment, and initiating them in kung-an, or hua-t'ou practice, while continuing to assume that for the vast majority of laity the important teaching was karma and merit practice. Ta-hui went as far as possible beyond the distinction between teaching and practice for laymen and teaching and practice for monks, encouraging all his lay hearers to understand the truth of emptiness and Hua-yen non-obstruction and to strive for enlightenment through kung-an or hua-t'ou practice.

Part I below will focus upon the P'u Shuo form itself, showing through a preliminary exploration of its history Ta-hui's original contribution to its development. Part II will look closely at one sermon to show how Ta-hui addressed the occasion of death and the emotions of bereavement on two levels in order in one sermon to meet the immediate spiritual needs of grieving laymen and to bring them to a higher understanding of the doctrine of emptiness and the path to enlightenment.

A. A Short History of the P'u Shuo Form

The P'u Shuo, or "General Preaching," was the last of three major sermon forms to be developed within the Ch'an monastery. Two earlier forms, the Shang T'ang 上堂 and the Hsiao Ts'an 小參, are mentioned

n the earliest recension of rules for Ch'an monasteries that remains o us, the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei 禪苑清規, published in 1103.[1] he P'u Shuo clearly grew out of these forms and resembled them in many espects, especially until the influence of Ta-hui was generally felt.

For the Shang T'ang it was prescribed in the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei hat the abbot of the Ch'an monastery should go to the Dharma seat in he Dharma Hall six times a month and address the whole assembly of ıonks who would be seated formally before him. The fifth day of the ıonth and all succeeding dates whose numbers were multiples of five were pecified as the days for Shang T'ang.[2] For the Hsiao Ts'an it was rescribed that preaching was to take place in the abbot's own quarters, he fang-chang 方丈, at least on the 3rd, 8th, 13th, 18th, 23rd and 8th of the month.[3] Both of these forms of preaching were open to aymen, who could both attend and ask that they be given, perhaps in onnection with a financial contribution. But the layman's part seems ıerely to have been to earn the merit of sponsoring a preaching of the aw: reference was rarely made in the abbot's remarks to the layman ıimself or to anything specific in his situation or that of laymen in

---

.. Kagamishima Genryū et al., Yaku-chū Zen-en shin-gi (Translated and nnotated Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei (Tokyo: Sōtō Shū Shūmu-chō, 1972), ;ives on pp. 1-28 full information on texts and history of this work; his is followed by a complete text and a Japanese translation. A text ıay be found also in Zokuzōkyō 2, 16.

. Kagamishima et al., Zen-en shin-gi, pp. 71-75.

. Ibid., pp. 78-85.

general.[1] Most commonly, the abbot's remarks would be preceded by questions from monks and an ensuing exchange between monks and the abbot; alternately the abbot himself would bring up a kung-an, or make a remark of his own about the Law and challenge his audience to understand what he had said. For the most part these sermons were short, or so it seems from their recorded lengths; they were not vehicles for expanded discussion of a topic.[2] For the monk, or lay resident following the discipline of the monastery, every thought was already directed toward developing wisdom or clearing away ignorance; in the context of such concentrated practice extended sermons would almost certainly be unnecessary, and might even be harmful, particularly if heard six or twelve times a month.

In the Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei of 1103 the P'u Shuo form is not mentioned. This suggests that the form was not in wide use prior to 1103. Short paragraphs describing the P'u Shuo form do appear in the next two extant rule books, the Ch'an-lin pei-yüng ch'ing-kuei 禪林備用清規 (finished in 1311)[3] and the Ts'ung-Lin chiao-ting ch'ing-kuei tsung-yao 叢林校定清規總要

---

1. See my survey of Yüan-wu's Shang T'ang and Hsiao Ts'an below, p. 85, fn. 1.

2. See below, p. 183.

3. A text may be found in Zokuzōkyō, 2, 17, 1; paragraph on P'u Shuo is on p. 36b. For date of this work, see Kagamishima et al., Zen-en shin-gi, pp. 2-3.

published in 1274.[1] In the absence of contrary evidence this would seem to indicate that the form came into wide use between 1103 and 1274.

Did Ta-hui invent the P'u Shuo form? If not, what was the P'u Shuo like prior to Ta-hui's use of it? The accounts in these rule books written more than 100 years after Ta-hui's death do not help us to answer these questions with any certainty, as they may tell us more about the P'u Shuo form as it developed after Ta-hui than about the form that Ta-hui invented or found and adapted as he began his own preaching. Nonetheless they do give us a picture of the context in which the P'u Shuo preaching took place, and they make a historical remark. For the reader's convenience I quote here only the later and more complete of the two, that of the rule book of 1311, noting in footnotes significant differences between the two fundamentally very similar texts:

> At all times when the P'u Shuo is given, an attendant orders the k'o-t'ou 客頭 of the abbot's quarters (one whose duty it is to attend to guests)[2] to hang up the sign for P'u Shuo in front of the Monks' Hall (the hall in which the monks lived) and the Sangha Hall (a hall in which the monks gathered to read sutras and eat and conduct other activities) and other halls, and also to arrange the seats in rows [for the

---

1. A text may be found in Zokuzōkyō, 2, 17, 1; paragraph on P'u Shuo is on p. 36b. For the date of this work, see Kagamishima et al., Zen-en shin-gi, pp. 2-3.

2. Cf. Muchaku Dōchū, Zenrin shōkisen (completed 1716), (Tokyo: Seishin Shobo, 1963), pp. 299-300.

> P'u Shuo] in the Inner Hall or the Dharma Hall.[1] (The Inner Hall was used for special ceremonies or lectures, the Dharma Hall for formal preaching of the Law.) When the meal is finished, the t'ang ssu hsing che 堂司行者 [2] informs the attendants and then informs the abbot. He strikes the drum five times. After the attendant leaves the Inner Hall he invites the assembly [of monks] to gather. [He then] goes in to invite the abbot to come out and take his seat.[3] The ceremonial for P'u Shuo is the same as that for Hsiao Ts'an.[4] The teachers in the Ts'ao-tung line set up a seat in the Sangha Hall on the first and fifteenth of every month[5] and "speak generally" to the assembly. Only the monk Ta-hui, who had mastered both the essence of the teaching and the art of preaching, didn't choose time or place [but gave P'u Shuo whenever or wherever it suited him].[6]

This account certainly suggests that although Ta-hui did use the form differently from his predecessors, he did not invent the form.

---

1. Ts'ung-lin chiao-ting ch'ing-kuei tsung-yao mentions only the Inner Hall. Chüan hsia, Zokuzōkyō 2, 17, 1, p. 15a.

2. An assistant to the wei na, one of the chief administrative officers of the monastery. Cf. Zenrin shōkisen, p. 299.

3. Ts'ung-lin chiao-ting ch'ing-kuei tsung-yao adds here: "Those in attendance and the two groups of officers of the monastery ask questions." (For more information on the two groups of officers, see Zenrin shōkisen, pp. 219-21).

4. Ts'ung-lin chiao-ting ch'ing-kuei tsung-yao adds here: "[Earlier] books of rules do not mention [the P'u Shuo]."

5. Ts'ung-lin chiao-ting ch'ing-kuei tsung-yao adds: "When the Shang T'ang is over."

6. Ts'ung-lin chiao-ting ch'ing-kuei tsung-yao omits this last sentence about Ta-hui.

A somewhat different historical account is given by Ta-hui himself:

> A hundred years ago there was no P'u Shuo. But in the period from Hsi-ning to Yüan-yu (between 1068 and 1094) when the monk Chen-ching lived at Tung-shan Kuei-tsung,[1] there began to be P'u Shuo. [Chen-ching's] great purpose was to bring students of the Way to enlightenment.[2]

This suggests that Chen-ching K'o-wen 真淨克文 (1025-1102) was the originator of the P'u Shuo form in the Lin-chi school of Ch'an. Ta-hui's statement became the accepted view of the origin of the form in later tradition, as is evidenced by the following summary of tradition on the subject by Muchaku Dōchū in Japan in 1716:

> P'u Shuo is a form of ascending the Dharma seat [to preach]. Shang T'ang is also [a form of] ascending the Dharma seat. The difference is that in the P'u Shuo one doesn't burn incense or wear the Dharma robe. [The practice of] P'u Shuo began with Chen-ching; the "three Buddhas" also practiced it. But only with Ta-hui did it [begin to] flourish.[3]

The historical accuracy of this traditional view is difficult to determine due to the nature of our sources. Chen-ching has left us a collection of "Recorded Sayings," but in them we find no record of a P'u Shuo.[4] The "three Buddhas" must refer to three disciples of the

---

1. Kuei-tsung temple was on Lu-shan in Nank'ang prefecture in Kiangsi province. What the connection to Tung-shan was I haven't yet been able to trace. Chen-ching K'o-wen was abbot of Lu-shan Kuei-tsung Ssu.

2. P'u Shuo, p. 460a.

3. Muchaku Dōchū, Zenrin shōkisen, p. 433.

4. The result of my own search is confirmed by Muchaku Dōchū, Zenrin shōkisen, p. 436.

Lin-chi master Wu-tsu Fa-yen 五祖法演 (? - 1104) whose names or nicknames included the word "Buddha" (Fo, 佛): Yüan-wu K'o-ch'in (1063-1135), known as Fo-kuo 佛果 ("Buddha Fruit"); Fo-chien ("Buddha Mirror") Hui-ch'in 佛鑑慧懃 (1059-1117), and Fo-yen ("Buddha Eye") Ch'ing-yüan 佛眼清遠 (1067-1120). Of these three only two have left "Recorded Sayings" still extant, namely Yüan-wu and Fo-yen.[1] In both cases we do find P'u Shuo.

B. P'u Shuo by Ta-hui's Predecessors Yüan-wu and Fo-yen

What were P'u Shuo like before Ta-hui? How did they differ from Shang T'ang and Hsiao Ts'an? To what extent were laymen their sponsors? To what extent are the needs of laymen reflected in their occasions, their form or their content? The existence of P'u Shuo in the records of Yüan-wu and Fo-yen give us some evidence with which to address these questions.

Yüan-wu was perhaps the most eminent Ch'an teacher in the Lin-chi school during his lifetime. For this reason his Recorded Sayings are particularly extensive when compared to those of most of his contemporaries. Despite this we find in these records only one example of a P'u Shuo. This sermon in its recorded form runs some 1400 words.[2]

---

1. I base this statement on Yanagida Seizan, ed., Zenke goroku, II, pp. 432-514, especially p. 435 and pp. 485-91. Yanagida does not know of a "Recorded Sayings" for Fo-chien Hui-ch'in.

2. Yüan-wu's P'u Shuo can be found in Yüan-wu Fo-kuo Ch'an-shih yü-lu, chüan 13, in Taishō 47, pp. 774-75.

It is a straightforward discourse on the Law and contains no specific reference to lay practice or to laymen. A large part of it is an account of Yüan-wu's own search for the truth and his initial enlightenment experience. It is a lively and witty sermon describing certain fundamental truths of the Dharma and the freedom that realization of them brings; it exhorts students to plunge in and realize these truths for themselves. It is, however, much longer than the average length of Yüan-wu's Shang T'ang or Hsiao Ts'an as recorded: the former average 200 words and the latter 442 words.[1] It was also clearly given on a special occasion,[2] but there is no mention of lay sponsorship.

Yüan-wu's Dharma brother Fo-yen also left extensive "Recorded Sayings" that have survived to the present.[3] In them we find nine talks designated "P'u Shuo," and 39 talks recorded immediately after them under the heading of "Shan Yü 善語 (Good Talks);" these latter may or may not have been delivered as P'u Shuo, but since the format of the "Recorded Sayings" is ambiguous, and since they are identical in form and length to the nine that are clearly marked "P'u Shuo," I will consider them here tentatively as such. This impression is strengthened

---

1. See footnote on p. 186.

2. It was a Kao-hsiang P'u Shuo. For differences between this and other kinds of P'u Shuo, see Zenrin shōkisen, p. 436.

3. Fo-yen Ch'ing-yüan's P'u Shuo can be found in Fo-yen Ch'an-shih yü-lu, chüan 5, in Ku-tsun-su yü-lu, chüan 31, Zokuzōkyō 2, 23, 4, pp. 280b-96a.

by the appearance immediately after them of a tenth clearly marked P'u Shuo that is further identified as having been given at the request of a layman.[1] The first nine P'u Shuo average 460 words each; the following 39 average 420 words each. The final sermon for a layman is approximately 1140 words; it is the second longest of the sermons.

In content none of Fo-yen's P'u Shuo (or Shan Yü) make reference in the body of the sermon to a lay donor or to his situation, past history or needs. The first of the nine P'u Shuo, for example, devotes most of its 320 words to types of Ch'an sickness, a subject of great interest to monks engaged in trying to "throw away body and mind" in the practice of kung-an inspection or silent concentration, but of very little relevance to laymen.[2] The 49th sermon, the one designated as being given for a layman, seems to be similar in content and form to those that preceded it that were clearly addressed to "students of the Way," a term that in Fo-yen's sermons appears to refer only to those who had entered the monastery to study. More information about the layman or the context in which the sermon was preached might reveal that the sermon was addressed to the needs of the sponsoring layman, but no signs of such an intention appear to a reader without this knowledge.

---

1. Ibid., pp. 295a-296a, "Wei Li She-jen P'u Shuo."

2. Of course a layman might desire to hear a sermon on this topic.

C. P'u Shuo by Ta-hui's Contemporaries

Hsü-t'ang Chih-yü 虛堂智愚 (1185-1269) suggests that "since the 'three Buddhas,' all [the teachers] have had P'u Shuo."[1] This raises the question as to whether Ta-hui's contemporaries also practiced the giving of P'u Shuo sermons, and if so, whether their sermons differed in form, length, intended audience or manner of addressing that audience from those of Ta-hui's predecessors or from those of Ta-hui. To answer these questions I have made a preliminary survey of the surviving records of 38 of Ta-hui's contemporaries and juniors in four different Ch'an schools.[2] I have placed in Appendix C the detailed results of this survey for the benefit of the reader who has greater curiosity about the history of the form. Here I offer only a summary of my findings in the following chart on p. 183, and a few observations on the way in which the form was used during Ta-hui's lifetime.

The first thing that may strike the reader on glancing at the chart is that P'u Shuo sermons were recorded very infrequently: in most cases for a given teacher only one to three P'u Shuo were recorded. Were they in fact given so infrequently? It is possible that a much larger proportion of those given may not have been recorded than in the case of the Shang T'ang or Hsiao Ts'an sermon forms. But we might be able to presume that either P'u Shuo were infrequently given, or they were not regarded as a very serious or formal occasion for teaching.

---

1. Hsü-t'ang Chih-yü Ho-shang yü-lu, chüan 4, "Shuang Lin Hsia Ch'ien Kao-hsiang P'u Shuo," Zokuzōkyō 2, 26, p. 360b.

2. See Appendix C for complete list.

I. P'u Shuo by Ta-hui's Predecessors in Existing Records:[1]

1.	Chen-ching K'o-wen (1025-1102)	0	
2.	Fo-chien Hui-ch'in (1059-1117)	no record	
3.	Fo-yen Ch'ing-yüan (1067-1120)	9 39 1	400 wds. avg. 420 wds. avg. 1140 wds.
4.	Fo-kuo Yüan-wu K'o-ch'in (1063-1135)	1	1400 wds.

II. P'u Shuo by Ta-hui's Approximate Contemporaries in Existing Records:[2]

1.	Hsüeh-t'ang Tao-hsing (1089-1151) 雪堂道行	2	280 wds. 540 wds.
2.	Shan-t'ang Seng-hsün (dates unknown) 山堂僧洵	1	560 wds.
3.	Hsüeh-feng Hui-k'ung (1096-1158) 雪峰慧空	2	180 wds. 400 wds.
4.	Fo-hai Hui-yüan (1115-1169) 佛海慧原	3	1280 wds. 800 wds. 820 wds.
5.	P'u-an Yin-su (1115-1169) 普庵印肅	1	1120 wds.
6.	Sung-yüan Ch'ung-yüeh (1132-1202) 松源崇岳	2	1224 wds. 700 wds.

III. P'u Shuo by Ta-hui in Existing Records:[3]

1.	P'u Shuo in one chüan	14 (in some texts 13 or 15)	2503 wds. avg.
2.	P'u Shuo in four chüan	66	2294 wds. avg.
	Total:	±80	2346 wds. avg.

---

1. See note on pp. 178-80.

2. See notes to Appendix C for references.

3. See Appendix C for text information.

This then raises the question of why so many more were recorded for Fo-yen and for Ta-hui than for any other teacher: was it a matter of their skill with the form or of their attitude toward it? Or was it simply that they gave P'u Shuo far more frequently than others did?

Second, P'u Shuo as recorded were generally short: the majority were recorded in well under a thousand words.

Third, P'u Shuo were not in wide use. In the records of 38 of Ta-hui's contemporaries and juniors we have P'u Shuo by only 6 different teachers.

Fourth, the form for P'u Shuo was apparently identical to those of the Shang T'ang and Hsiao Ts'an: all three most often began with a question and answer exchange between monk and teacher, and continued with comments by the teacher arising out of that exchange. Alternately the teacher himself would bring up a kung-an or a remark on the Law. It seems only to be in the ritual forms that accompany the P'u Shuo that it differs in form from the Hsiao Ts'an and the Shang T'ang.

Fifth, the P'u Shuo we have recorded were very rarely recorded as having been sponsored by laymen. Only the one sermon by Fo-yen has a reference to a lay sponsor.

Sixth, in the content of these P'u Shuo there is very little indication that they were addressed to an audience that included laymen. In some cases P'u Shuo may have been longer and more discursive than Shang T'ang by the same teacher, though not necessarily longer than the Hsiao Ts'an. But the P'u Shuo do not refer in any way to the particular requirements of lay practice or lay life; even in the one case in which we have lay sponsorship we find no reference to the layman, or to the

occasion in his life that led him to sponsor the sermon, or to his intention in doing so. The strongest impression one receives on reading these sermons is that they were regarded primarily as devices for teaching monks, just as were the Shang T'ang and Hsiao Ts'an.

D. Ta-hui's Use of the P'u Shuo Form

What we have seen of the use of the P'u Shuo form by predecessors and contemporaries of Ta-hui suggests that it was generally regarded as a sermon similar in form and purpose to the Shang T'ang and Hsiao Ts'an forms, though perhaps less formal. Ta-hui's use of the P'u Shuo form differed from his use of the Shang T'ang and Hsiao Ts'an forms[1] as well as from his colleagues' use of the P'u Shuo form. It is

1. For purposes of comparison I have made a study of Ta-hui's use of the more traditional Shang T'ang sermon form. Two hundred and thirteen of Ta-hui's Shang T'ang are recorded in his Recorded Sayings. Those that have no stated connection with laymen or lay sponsorship are notably short in their recorded form, averaging about 130 words each. Only fifteen of the 213 are ones in which laymen are either the sponsor or the occasion of the remarks. These fifteen are a bit longer, averaging 358 words each. Of these fifteen, four can be clearly identified as meeting the needs of laymen in connection with death. Thus, if the sample of 213 may be taken as representative, Ta-hui in the Shang T'ang kept his remarks very short and only a little more than 7% of the time used this form as one in which to address laymen.

As for Ta-hui's Hsiao Ts'an, I find only one recorded in Ta-hui's Recorded Sayings. It is approximately 175 words and has no reference to laymen. The copy of Ta-hui P'u-chüeh Ch'an-shih yü-lu that I used for this search is that in Shukuzōkyō, T'eng 8; the Hsiao Ts'an is on p. 17b.

The reader may at this point wonder whether Ta-hui might perhaps merely have substituted one form for another, using the P'u Shuo form in the way that his predecessors used the Shang T'ang or the Hsiao Ts'an. I have not had time to make the complete survey of all of the sermon forms as used by all of Ta-hui's predecessors and contemporaries in the Sung that would be required to test this hypothesis; in the absence of such a study my argument that Ta-hui created a new way of using a

our contention here that these differences indicate a deliberate altering of the P'u Shuo form to enable it to serve the specific purpose of communication with lay or partly lay audiences.

First, many more of Ta-hui's P'u Shuo were recorded than had ever been the case before. We have approximately 80 P'u Shuo by Ta-hui in present records, including a volume of P'u Shuo in 4 chuan that circulated

---

relatively new form must remain merely tentative and suggestive. However, as a beginning, I have looked at the Shang T'ang and Hsiao Ts'an of Yüan-wu. I have chosen Yüan-wu because his lay following was very large, at least the equal of that of Ta-hui, and because his Recorded Sayings are extensive. Here are the results:

Hsiao Ts'an:

Total	Total invited by laymen
81	11 (13.5%)
Average length	Number addressing laymen or their needs directly
442 words	0

Shang T'ang:

Total	Total invited by laymen
247	ca. 39 (15%)
Average length	Number addressing laymen or their needs directly
200 words	1 (?)

If we compare these figures with the ones given on p.183 above for Ta-hui's P'u Shuo, we can see that Ta-hui was not merely doing under another name something Yüan-wu had done in his Shang T'ang or Hsiao Ts'an. The fact that Yüan-wu was the teacher whose Dharma Ta-hui inherited, and was therefore the person whose patterns of teaching Ta-hui was most likely to adopt, makes this difference in the frequency and the manner of their addressing laymen in sermons stronger evidence of Ta-hui's originality than it would be if Yüan-wu were merely a famous predecessor.

separately in addition to his Recorded Sayings. As the reader has surely noted already, Fo-yen Ch'ing-yuan is the only other teacher among those surveyed who left a record of more than five.

Second, Ta-hui's P'u Shuo average over 2300 words in length. This is nearly double the length of the longest P'u Shuo prior to his time. In practice what this means is that Ta-hui allowed himself the scope to introduct a number of themes and develop a number of ideas. As I have argued above that short sermons are more suited to the practice of monks, so I would suggest here that the lengthening of the form made the P'u Shuo more useful for addressing audiences that included laymen.

Third, 55 of Ta-hui's 80 P'u Shuo, or 69%, were given at the request of laymen.

Fourth, where a P'u Shuo was given at a layman's request, Ta-hui always acknowledged the lay sponsor by name and almost always referred also to the lay sponsor's intention to transfer the merit earned in sponsoring the P'u Shuo to another person, or to use it to further the development of his own wisdom. This acknowledgement was not allowed to usurp the main function of teaching, but it was always made. Where a monk or another teacher invited Ta-hui to preach, there was usually no reference to him in the P'u Shuo itself.

Fifth and most importantly, Ta-hui departed from the usual practice in that he addressed the specific needs of the lay donor in the body of the sermon itself. Ta-hui almost always told his hearers more about the donor than his name, and where he saw that the occasion for the sponsorship reflected a personal need, as in the case of sermons sponsored

the period immediately following the death of a relative, he addressed ie needs of the sponsor directly.

Ta-hui did not alter the outlines of the P'u Shuo form as he found :. His P'u Shuo began, as had those of his predecessors, with an :change between himself and monks, and then continued with a paragraph-ing comment on some aspect of the questions or answers. His retention : these traditional openings shows that he was concerned to retain the aning of the P'u Shuo as an occasion for the teaching of monks. But he multaneously expanded the form, used it or recorded it more frequently, id added remarks that made it a more direct means of addressing lay onsors and lay needs.

How did Ta-hui himself conceive of the P'u Shuo form? Although it ; tempting to read too much into it, nonetheless it is suggestive that ı-hui's one recorded discussion of the P'u Shuo form itself points his isteners to the Avataṃsaka sūtra:

> Now when the ancient (Chen-ching?) established this Dharma gate, he had a [scriptural] authority [for doing so]. How do we know? Don't you recall that in the Great Avatamsaka sūtra, in the "Departing from the World" chapter, the Bodhisattva P'u Hui 普慧 raised like a cloud two hundred questions, and the Bodhisattva P'u Hsien 普賢 poured forth two thousand answers. Among them there was the question: "What is meant by the name 'P'u shuo san chieh (literally: to preach universally, to the three worlds)'?" The answer was: "Sons of the Buddha, Bodhisattvas and Mahzāsattvas, there are ten kinds of preaching to the three worlds. What are the ten? In the world of the past to preach about the world of the past; in the world of the past to preach about the world of the future; in the world of the past to preach about the world of the present. In the world of the future to speak about the world of the present; in the world of the future to speak about the inexhaustible (the infinite). In the present world to speak about the past; in the present world to speak about the future; in the present world to speak about equality. That makes nine worlds. In addition, if one sees one's

> own single thought as penetrating the nine worlds as if it were a string stringing together a number of pearls, then this single thought binds all as the tenth world. Therefore it is said, in the present world one preaches to the three worlds, [for] this single thought makes them one.[1]

Let us restate the idea of this passage a little more concisely. One of the accomplishments of the Bodhisattva, one that must at first seem mysterious, even miraculous, is to be able to preach to a variety of realms simultaneously, so that persons in different worlds all hear him at once. Here the separate worlds at issue are the worlds of the past, the present and the future. P'u Hsien Bodhisattva (Samantabhadra) explains that one thought in the present can contain and unite all of the worlds of the past, present and future, if that thought is the transcendent thought of the enlightened Mind. To preach in the present through this one Mind that unites them all is to preach at once in all 9 modes of relation between preaching to time-world.

If we connect this passage to a more immediate and mundane plane, one can see the implications of the view that enlightened Mind unites and communicates with all realms, reveals their actual unity and interrelation within one indivisible totality, for preaching on different levels of understanding to mixed audiences, and for reaching out to

---

1. P'u Shuo, p. 460a. Muchaku Dōchū points out that Ta-hui is not quoting exactly from the text of the Avatamsaka sutra: the question in the original passage leaves out the word "p'u," or "generally." But later on in the passage there is the word "p'u shuo" in the sentence: "Therefore the ten Bodhisattvas by means of this preach generally to the three worlds." See Ta-fang-kuang Fo-hua-yen ching, chüan 53, in Taishō 10, no. 279, p. 281b, beginning with "yu shih chung shuo san chieh 有十種說三界."

transcend the distinction between monk and layman, between practice inside the monastery and practice beyond its walls. All of the different audiences of monks and laymen respond to preaching that comes from the One Mind of Enlightenment, for it is that one mind that penetrates and grounds their separate beings. As I hope will be made clear in Chapter VI, Ta-hui could well have found support for his understanding of his own mission in the world in the *Avataṃsaka*'s stress on unity, generality and totality: the title "*P'u Shuo*" and the scriptural authority for it he identifies are particularly suited to express his self-understanding and his intentions in using the form.[1]

E. A Sermon for the Dead: The Occasion

Although many different occasions in the life of laymen brought them to the monastery to sponsor *P'u Shuo*, and Ta-hui correspondingly addressed many different lay needs, among the most striking examples of *P'u Shuo* as "ministry" to laymen are to be found in Ta-hui's sermons on the occasion of memorial offerings by laymen on behalf of their dead relatives and friends.

---

1. Others in discussing the form have found other scriptural sources. Muchaku Dōchū cites two, both from the *Avataṃsaka sūtra*. The first is from the "Vairocana" chapter and a commentary on it where the meaning of the word "*p'u*" is given. The second is from the "Ten *Samādhis*" chapter, where reference is made directly to "*p'u shuo*", "preaching universally all the teachings of the Buddha." Muchaku finds this the most convincing scriptural authority for the name. Cf. Muchaku Dōchū, *Zenrin shōkisen*, pp. 434 and 436.

Making offerings of wealth or of the Law to earn merit for the dead is an ancient but controversial practice in Buddhism.[1] The idea that one could perform good acts and devote their good fruits to the future welfare of the dead is a development of the idea of the transfer of merit, an idea that arose first in connection with the Buddha's enabling gifts of his surplus merit to his disciples.[2] In the specific case of transfers to the dead, it was generally agreed that such transfers were most needed and most efficacious during the 49 days immediately after death when a "body" of the dead person would be in an intermediate stages of existence (chung yin 中陰 or chung yu 中有) between his last birth and his next. In this period in which the next birth is not yet decided, good karmic seeds sent to his aid might enable him to avoid the evil paths of existence and be reborn in the human world or in one of the heavens.[3] It was customary during this period to offer a meal to monks and to sponsor a reading of sūtras and/or a preaching of the Law every seven days through the forty-ninth day after the person's

---

1. For some indication of the controversy, see the "Tsuizen" paragraph in Muchaku Dōchū's Zenrin shōkisen, pp. 573-74.

2. See Mochizuki Shinkō, Bukkyō daijiten (3rd ed.; Tokyo: Seikai Shoten Kangyō Kyokai, 1960), I, p. 270, for sūtra references.

3. See Matsuura Shūko, Zenke no sōhō to tsuizenkuyo no kenkyū (Tokyo: Sankiho Busshorin, 1970), pp. 239-42. Also Mochizuki, IV, pp. 3648-650, "Chuu," and Mochizuki, II, pp. 1809-810, "Shijukunichi." Cf. Ti-tsang P'u-sa pen-yüan ching (translated into Chinese in 704 A.D.), chüan 2, chapter 7: "If you can within 49 days after the death of their bodies create a large number of good deeds, then you will cause all the sentient beings to be able forever to depart from the evil paths (evil states of rebirth) and to be born in human or heavenly realms and enjoy supreme and marvelous delight." (Taishō 53, p. 783, quoted in Matsuura, p. 239.)

death.[1] In Ta-hui's P'u Shuo we find three sermons recorded as given on the occasion of memorial offerings 35, 42, and 49 days after the death of the donor's relative.

It was customary also to have a memorial service on the 100th day after death. This was apparently a practice taken over from a similar Confucian custom, and was generally known by its Confucian name, "the memorial of the end of weeping (tsu k'u chi 卒哭忌)."[2] Confucians buried the body in its final resting place on this day, and on the following day placed the memorial tablet of the deceased in the ancestral hall.[3] In the Confucian usage the service marked a transition from a mood of consciousness of misfortune to one of hope for good fortune: on this day the deceased officially became an ancestor from whom his family could expect help.[4] Ta-hui followed the practice of conducting a service on the hundredth day, referring to the occasion by its Confucian name.[5]

---

1. Cf. Shih-shih yao-lan 釋氏要覽, compiled by the Sung monk Tao-ch'eng in 1019 A.D.: "As for the practice in the world of feasting for happiness on every seventh day, this is to 'follow to help with good' when the 'body' is in the intermediate existence between death and birth and to make seeds for his intermediate stage, to cause him not to be reborn in an evil path." (Taishō, 54, p. 305).

2. Matsuura, p. 269.

3. Ibid. In the case of Chinese Buddhists, as soon as the offering on this day was finished, a tablet for the deceased was placed on the Buddhist altar where other tablets of ancestors were placed, and prayers and offerings took place there henceforth as with other ancestors.

4. Ibid.

5. This practice was by that time surely in general Buddhist use; cf. Matsuura, pp. 268-70. Ta-hui shows by his frequent references to graves in this sermon that he expects the body to be buried on or near that day. See P'u Shuo, pp. 469a-470b.

We also have records of sermons for the dead by Ta-hui that must have been offered well after the period of mourning had ended.[1]

The P'u Shuo sermon the themes of which we shall explore in more detail was given by Ta-hui at the request of a Sung official, T'ang Ssu-t'ui.[2] T'ang Ssu-t'ui held a number of important posts in the Sung government; at the time of Ta-hui's return from exile he held the positions of Signatory Official of the Bureau of Military Affairs and Provisional Executive of the Secretariat-Chancellery.[3] These high offices made him one of the four or five highest ranking officers of the state. T'ang's daughter, whom we only know as Lady T'ang, had recently died at age 22. In the opening section of the sermon Ta-hui says that today's sermon is due to the intention of the Minister to transfer merit to his deceased daughter Lady T'ang on the occasion of the 42nd day after her death. The purpose of this transfer is to contribute to her happiness in the world of the dead; to this end the Minister

---

1. See for example P'u Shuo, pp. 450b-451b, which is a P'u Shuo offered for a number of deceased relatives simultaneously. While it is conceivable that they might have all died at once, it is unlikely.

2. This sermon is found in P'u Shuo, pp. 468a through 469a. Further references will not be given for passages quoted or summarized from these pages.

3. T'ang Ssu-t'ui 湯思退, whose tzu was Chin-chih 進之, held a number of important posts during the Sung dynasty. His biography appears in the SS, chüan 371. Aside from two sermons in connection with his daughter's death, we have a copy of his invitation to Ta-hui to preach included at the end of the P'u Shuo, and a letter to him included in Ta-hui shu, chüan hsia. He is also mentioned in Nien-p'u, p. 92, where it is mentioned that he established a Wu-ai Hui 無礙會.

has ordered Ta-hui to ascend the [Dharma] seat and propagate Wisdom (Prajñā).

F. A sermon for the Dead: The Teaching

What distinguished the way Ta-hui addressed laymen on the subject of grief and death from the way he addressed monks?

The first observation one can make is that the doctrines of karma, transmigration, and rebirth receive far more emphasis than one would expect in sermons addressed to monks.[1] In this sermon Ta-hui uses the doctrines of karma and transmigration, in the case of Lady T'ang and others, to comfort the bereaved. The deceased has led a good life, building up good karma toward enlightenment. The result has been a peaceful and clear mind at the time of death. This in turn is a definite sign of a desirable rebirth to come.

> I have heard that Lady T'ang's character was high and that she knew of the Buddha's teaching. She must have early planted the wisdom seeds of Prajñā deeply, thereby being enabled in this life to believe in the Great Matter.[2] At the moment of

---

1. In what we shall call the karmic understanding, death is seen as an event in the broader context of the samsaric stream of repeated lives and deaths. In this understanding, the character of one's lives and deaths is determined by the quality of one's past deeds. Births may take place in ten planes of existence, of which the three "evil paths," i.e., hells, the realm of hungry ghosts, and the animal realm, are the most frequent. More desirable are births in the human realm, the realm of asuras, and the realm of devas or heavenly beings. Most desirable of all, but not frequent, are births as a bodhisattva, a pratyekabuddha, a śrāvaka, and a Buddha. It is important in this context to do good deeds to ensure one's own happiness in future births or that of others.

2. "Tz'u tuan ta-shih yin-yüan 此段大事因緣," more exactly "this important karmic occasion," that is, enlightenment to the Dharma.

> abandoning consciousness she was clear in mind, and died with her hands folded in the Amitabha mudrā. This is just what [Tsung-mi][1] talked about: "To do correct[2] things is awakened mind; awakened mind does not come from emotions. At death it can turn karma." He added a note to this: "'Correctness' is the 'correctness' of 'meaningful principle', not the 'correctness (righteousness)' of 'benevolence and righteousness'." If people follow correct principle in their actions, then at the moment of death,[3] they will be able to fold their hands and form a mudrā without any pain or distress. Surely if in life they follow correct principle, in death they can turn [the course of] karma [for the better]. If so, then it is certain that they will be reborn in [the Pure Land].[4]

One need not grieve nor be apprehensive about the fate of one so protected by good karma. Death is no more than a transition, a taking off of old, worn-out clothes and a donning of new ones:

> I have heard that your excellency is in deep grief, and your pain and hurt have not yet ended. How can one use one's limited energy of spirit to weep for an insensible soul? For the dead lady, her death

---

1. Text has "Kuei-feng Ch'an-shih" 圭峯禪師, one of the names of the famous creator of a synthesis between Ch'an and Hua-yen philosophy Kuei-feng Tsung-mi 圭峯宗密 (780-841). This passage is included in Ching-te chuan-teng lu (Taipei: Chen Shan Mei Chu-pan-she, second printing, 1968), chuan 13, "Chung Nan-shan Kuei-feng Tsung-mi Ch'an-shih," pp. 61-67, on p. 67. Tsung-mi has supplied his own extended commentary on his verse.

2. "Tso yu-i shih 作有義事."

3. Literally: "At the moment of one's repaying karmic ties and saying good-bye... (pao-yüan hsieh-shih 報緣謝時)."

4. Literally: "The world of peace and nourishment (an-yang 安養)," another name for the Pure Land.

> is like suddenly taking off worn-out garments she has been wearing for many years, and going to be reborn in a heaven or a Buddha-land or some other place. Since the dead and the living are separated, what is the use of crying?[1]

Turning to the reverse side of the coin, Ta-hui stresses in graphic and powerful images the terrors that death presents to one who has not prepared for it. Here his aim of course is not to comfort but to exhort the hearers to make effort to seek enlightenment:

> Tsung-mi went on to say: "That which does things with no correctness is crazy, confused mind. Crazy, disordered mind turns this way and that according to feelings. At death it is entangled by karma." That is to say, when the four great elements part and scatter, and consciousness[2] becomes dark and confused, those who in their lifetimes were passionately attached to love are ensnared by love; those who were passionately attached to gold and precious jewels are ensnared by gold and jewels. At that time one's thoughts fly off like wild horses;[3] karmically determined consciousness rules [one's mind], and ghosts come to borrow a roof. This kind of person, because he has done incorrect things and become entangled by karma, enters an evil rebirth. If there are no heavens, then that is that. If there are, then a superior man will be born there. If there are no hells, then that is that. If there are, then base men will enter them.

Here we find a subtle shift: no longer is it good karma which guarantees a safe and calm passage through the transition of death, it is the Enlightened Mind alone that can do so. Although good works lead to

---

1. P'u Shuo, pp. 461b-462a.

2. Literally: "spirit and consciousness (shen-shih 神識)."

3. "Ye ma 野馬" also is used to mean "mist in the daytime" or "heat haze"; this would be another possible translation.

enlightenment, and thus are valuable, it is not enough to perform good works, one must actively seek enlightenment. Death comes quickly--if one does not hasten to find enlightenment, one will be overcome by pain and confusion, fear and desire. Death is the moment of testing: however successfully maintained one's facade of virtue and wisdom, it will fail one at the approach of death:

> I often see men of the world all their lives loving to create counterfeit and pretense. When they come to the 30th day of the last month [of the year] (i.e., the day on which all accounts must be settled before the start of the new year, a metaphor for the day of death), all of the sufferings of the five skandhas appear at once. At that time both their hands and their feet are revealed (i.e., the reality behind the pretense becomes impossible to hide), for at times of drawing near to life and death, fortune and misfortune, absolutely no pretense is possible or serviceable. Only the real thing will do.

What then is the "real thing" that can respond to the event of death? Ta-hui raises this question:

> What is the "real thing"? For example, Lady T'ang was 22 years old this year. Tell me, 22 years ago, before she came to Minister T'ang's family to be born, where did she dwell?[1] If you don't know where she came from, then birth is a great matter. And did this great distress of her sudden death exist then, or not? [Her mind was] clear and untroubled as if death were like throwing away old shoes--just where did this one moment [of her mind's activity] go? If you don't know where that went, then death is a great matter. Therefore it is said, "impermanence (i.e., death) is coming quickly; [the

---

1. Literally: "rest her body and set her life (an-shen li-ming 安身立命)."

question of] life and death is a great matter."[1]
A Confucian also said, "Death and life are great."[2]

Death is not only the moment of testing, it also poses the ultimate question, for death and birth are the ultimate riddles that confront the unenlightened mind. If a very loose use of the word may be permitted, for Ta-hui death is perhaps the hua-t'ou par excellence. A person who does not know what will happen to him after death, not in the sense of where he will be reborn but in the sense of who he ultimately is, does not know the most important truth about himself. He is confused by his form, the worldly embodiment of his desires, and does not see into his true Nature. The riddle of death is a form of the riddle of the meaning of existence that, if one is to be wise, he must confront and solve for himself. The fact of the inevitability of death and the shortness and unpredictability of our span in human form also determine the manner of our confrontation with the riddle of the meaning of existence: death both throws into high relief our ignorance and its consequences and imbues our search for wisdom with a sense of temporal urgency. Death is the event to come on which our doubt (that is, our ignorance become conscious of itself) can be focused most effectively.

---

1. This line is found in a different order in the Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch, chapter 7. My translation follows that of Lu K'uan Yu (Charles Luk) in Ch'an and Zen Teaching, 3rd series (London: Rider and Co., 1962), p. 73.

2. This phrase appears in Chuang-tzu, Chapter 5, "Te Ch'ung Fu" 德充符 : "Chung Ni yüeh: ssu sheng yi ta yi, erh pu te yü chih pien". 仲尼曰死生亦大矣而不得與之變 Chuang-tzu puts this statement in the mouth of Chung Ni, or Confucius; perhaps for that reason Ta-hui says that a Confucian said it. The second half of the sentence reminds one of the Doctrine of the Mean, Chapter 10, verse 5: "Chih ssu pu pien 至死不變."

Thus the occasion of death allows Ta-hui to arouse in his lay and clerical listeners the motivation to seek enlightenment.

Grief too is to be understood as an inevitable concomitant of the karmic bond between close relatives. It is one's karma from many births that causes one to be attached to one's child, for example:

> What parents love, how can they not think [obsessively] about? If they were able not to think about their children, then children would also be able not to think about their parents. If this were so, then one's Nature endowed by Heaven could be destroyed. Moreover, body, hair and skin are all inherited from our parents. When my body is in pain, then the body of my father and mother are also in pain. Since parents suffer pain this way, is it possible to talk about [their] not thinking [distractedly about their departed children]?

Ta-hui's wisdom and compassion appear in his refusal to urge the bereaved not to grieve. Not to grieve, he says, would be unnatural. Instead, grieve with your whole mind, feel and express all of your feelings; when the feelings of grief exhaust themselves, in that still moment is your opportunity for reflection and enlightenment: the natural expression of grief leads to an occasion for the development of wisdom:

> Some teach people not to think [distractedly about the departed], but this understanding falls into one-sidedness.[1] If you want to overcome distress, then today you must feel distress. If you wish not to have your mind occupied with distracted thoughts [of your child], then today you must allow it to be so occupied. Think back and forth, think up and down,

---

1. Literally: "to tzai i-pien 墮在一邊." It is one-sided because it recognizes a distinction between thinking and non-thinking, and instead of saying that both are empty, identifies one as preferable.

> until the habit formations of love are eliminated, and you will naturally reach the place of no thinking, the place of no distress. If today I urged you not to think, not to be distressed, that would be like pouring oil on a fire to put it out."[1]

In yet another sermon Ta-hui suggests:

> Therefore if you want to cry, just cry; if you want to think [distractedly], only think. Suddenly when you have cried to the point of thought and love being exhausted, then examine [your] thoughts.[2]

Ta-hui thus uses the beliefs in karma and transmigration, and the understanding of grief that they offer, to comfort, to explain, and to mobilize emotions that might motivate a serious search for enlightenment. It is the inexorability of karma that makes death a great matter on the provisional level of truth in terms of which the unenlightened man lives his life. Karma is within its own sphere all-powerful: even Śākyamuni, who can empty all forms and complete the wisdom of the 10,000 dharmas, cannot extinguish determined karma. How much less then can the ordinary man?

But Ta-hui does not neglect to offer his lay followers his ultimate understanding of death. This of course is that death is empty, a non-event because there is no self, no one who can be said to have been born or to die. To realize this, is to realize the emptiness of karma and thereby transcend it; this is the only way out of the clutches of karmic retribution.

---

1. P'u Shuo, p. 472a.

2. P'u Shuo, p. 422a.

We find this theme woven throughout the sermons. For example, Ta-hui opens his sermon with this statement:

> If you clear a path in this direction (i.e., toward knowing what it is that the Buddhas and patriarchs transmitted), you will know that although Lady T'ang was born years ago, she fundamentally was never born; her extinguishing today likewise fundamentally did not extinguish anything. Born and not born, like a reflection in a mirror; extinguished and yet not extinguished, like the moon in the water. The image in the mirror, the moon in the water, [both] can be seen but not grasped.

At the climax of the sermon he poses this same truth in a more engimatic form:

> The realm of sentient beings originally has no increase or extinction,
> Moreover not a single person can abide in its dharmas.
> To have dharmas and no abiding is called having no dharmas;
> Having no dharmas and having no abiding is called no mind.
> According to my understanding the Buddha also has no magic powers,
> Yet he can by means of no mind penetrate all dharmas.

Ta-hui comments:

> If you can understand "no dharmas and no abiding is called no mind; according to my understanding the Buddha also has no magic powers," then you will understand the saying of the ancient, "On one tip of a lion's hair a billion lion's hairs appear; for a thousand, ten thousand, only know how to grasp one." What then is the one? Birth and you don't know where you come from, death and you don't know where you go. Make effort, and in this lifetime you will grasp it.[1]

---

1. That is, understand and obtain it.

And again at the very close of the sermon, in his final gāthā, he says:

> Today [the Minister] has completed a cycle of Buddha-deeds
> And has asked me to turn the wheel of the Dharma (i.e., to preach).
> The wheel that I have turned has no movement,
> The Dharma that I have preached has no words.
> You must know that the departed daughter was never born
> And now today has never been extinguished.
> Since there is no birth and extinction, and no cycle of rebirth,
> There is neither changing nor destroying of the diamond body.

The two major themes of Ta-hui's sermon, the theme of karmic retribution and the theme of the emptiness of birth and death, are reconcileable within one framework of thought, as Ta-hui elsewhere points out. Karmic causation is on one level a true and useful description of the world in which we live as unenlightened beings; if we prematurely take an "enlightened" standpoint and declare karma to be empty and therefore irrelevant, we will find that we will still suffer the unpleasant results of our evil actions, and the pains of our suffering will have their own experiental reality.[1] Karmic causation is also a

---

1. Elsewhere Ta-hui says: "Although you can say that faults in their nature are originally empty, when the time comes when you cannot avoid suffering the retribution, there really is pain" (P'u Shuo, p. 458b).

true description of the path toward enlightenment: the greater our merits accumulated over many lifetimes, the greater our opportunities to hear the Dharma and become enlightened. Thus meritorious acts may be considered a step toward enlightenment.

But from another point of view these two themes are difficult to reconcile. Enlightenment is after all the realization of the emptiness of karmic causality. So long as one continues to consider his deeds only in the framework of karmic retribution, he will be enlightened to the truth of emptiness. Furthermore, the orientation toward the proximate goals of happiness through merits seems to require a different kind of religious approach than does the goal of an enlightenment that enables one to transcend the pleasures and pains of saṃsāra.[1] One could imagine a number of logical and definitional moves to overcome this apparent divergence of goals: for example, one might say that it is the quality of enlightenment or selflessness (no-mind) in any act that makes it worthy of merits. But Ta-hui does not try to reconcile the two different goals: he suggests that Lady T'ang by virtue of her merits of wisdom will certainly be born in the Pure Land; then he suggests that a "correct thought" of enlightenment might free her from saṃsāra altogether. He encourages the transfer of merits that she might avoid the three evil paths of existence in her next birth, and then announces that she has never been born and has never died. Far from reconciling these two themes, he seems to play them off against one another, using the forceful

1. Cf. Winston L. King, In the Hope of Nibbana (LaSalle, Illinois: Open Court Publishing Company, 1964) for one discussion of this dichotomy as it affects ethics.

emotions evoked by belief in karmic retribution both to offer comfort to the grieving and to spur monastic and lay listeners alike to confront the riddle of death and realize the ultimate truth of emptiness.

An attempt has been made in this chapter to show that Ta-hui transformed the P'u Shuo form into an instrument that would permit him to address the needs of laymen directly as well as the needs of monks. To say what he wanted to say, Ta-hui needed a vastly expanded sermon form. Some of the reasons for this have been mentioned above; the one reason that might be brought out now that we have looked at a typical sermon for the dead is that in these sermons sponsored by laymen two levels of truth, and two levels of practice, constantly had to be brought together and related to one another. If Ta-hui had been preaching only to monks, mention of the truth of emptiness or of the Hua-yen understanding of totality would have been enough, and a lengthy exposition would not have been necessary. But many laymen were used to thinking of themselves as limited in their Buddhist understanding and practice to the sphere of karmically significant good deeds, birth and rebirth. Ta-hui could have chosen simply to preach to them on this level, believing as he did that karmic causality is a true and important dimension of reality, and knowing as he did that it was what most laymen expected to hear preached to them. But Ta-hui was not content with this, for he earnestly believed that laymen could develop wisdom and become enlightened even while living ordinary lives in the world. Therefore his every invocation of the provisional truth of karma was made in order to bring laymen as well

as monks to see the need to find the ultimate truth that transcends the truth of karma without negating it.

In the sermons on death we see this interweaving of the two levels of truth particularly clearly. The sermon is given to create merits for the deceased; death must be responded to on that level. Yet death is not fully understood until it is seen to be empty. Understanding on the one level must be combined with understanding on the other; practice on the level of deeds and fruits must be combined with practice toward enlightenment. Comfort and reassurance based on the fairness and regularity of karmic retribution, bolstered by the sense of something still left to be done for the departed, must be combined with the arousing of emotions connected with death to spur laymen and monks alike to see enlightenment. Either level of understanding without the other would be perniciously one-sided. Death is the ideal occasion that brings together karmic faith and the doubt and fear that if focused wisely can lead to enlightenment.

Genuinely to meet the needs of the layman for reassurance and counsel in his immediate grief, to confirm his karmic understanding while at the same time using this occasion to urge upon him the truth of emptiness as the only real solution to the riddle posed by death, such tasks require a skillful interweaving of themes in an extended talk. The fact that Ta-hui apparently shaped the P'u Shuo to meet this need, and that he used it to construct sermons of the kind we have just examined, shows a very positive approach to the involvement of laymen in the Ch'an school and its monastic institutions; in Ta-hui's case it specifically shows as well a commitment to the possibility of a

path to enlightenment in lay daily life. Ta-hui's concern to show that Ch'an practice need not take place in separation from the world is a very creative response to the new Ch'an lay constituency that we find growing in the Sung dynasty.

It has been argued that this increasing involvement of the laity in Ch'an life ruined the purity of Ch'an teaching and practice. The sermon we have just examined, while certainly given in a new spirit, cannot yet be said to exemplify a watering down of the Dharma of a neglect of the needs of monks in training: the teaching in both the preliminary exchanges and the body of the sermon itself may be seen to be still of a very high order. Whether Ta-hui's synthetic attempt to meet two disparate needs simultaneously brought unfortunate results for the Ch'an school in the hands of lesser followers is a subject for further study.

Chapter VI: Hua-Yen Thought and Lay Practice

Ta-hui's reputation rests rightly upon his excellence as a teacher and a preacher rather than upon his originality as a thinker. Where his thought is original, it is where it grows directly out of experience and observation of *hua-t'ou* practice and enlightenment, as for example in his remarks about using doubt as a force to break through to enlightenment (see Chapter VIII). He saw intellectual clarification which could be obtained through the study and reflection upon doctrine as useless without enlightenment, while the understanding born of enlightenment made it clear that doctrines only formulated that wisdom which was already completely given in one's own enlightened Mind. Nonetheless, the modern reader is struck immediately by the frequency with which Ta-hui quotes and refers to sūtra literature in his letters and sermons. Not only is Ta-hui very familiar with the stories and *hua-t'ou* of all branches of the Ch'an school, he also quotes frequently from the *Lotus sūtra*, the *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa*, the *Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment* (*Yüan-chüeh ching*), the *Diamond sūtra*, and the *Hua-yen* (*Avataṃsaka*) *sūtra*, to name but a few. His references to stories, technical terms and passages from the sūtra literature present a marked contrast with the relative absence of such references in the *Recorded Sayings* from the period of the greatest Ch'an masters such as Lin-chi and Ma-tsu in the late T'ang. One reason may have been the beginning of the widespread use of printing in the Northern Sung for the dissemination of works such as the "Recorded Sayings" of Ch'an masters. This development no doubt encouraged students to record and publish far more of a given teacher's words

than had before been desirable. But Ta-hui's enthusiasm for quotations from sūtras may also have its roots in an apparent paradox. In addition to his clear belief that Ch'an wisdom is passed from enlightened mind to enlightened mind apart from and independent of doctrine (chiao-wai pieh chuan 教外別傳), he also seemed to have been perfectly comfortable with the idea that doctrine and Ch'an are really one (chiao Ch'an i-chih 教禪一致).

Of all of the sūtras to which Ta-hui refers, the one which seems to have been his favorite was the Hua-yen sūtra. In this preference he was by no means unique in the late Northern Sung and early Southern Sung. The Hua-yen sūtra, and the teachings of the Hua-yen scholastic masters of the T'ang, Fa-tsang 法藏, Ch'eng-kuan 澄觀, Li T'ung-hsüan 李通玄, and Ts'ung-mi, appear to have attracted considerable attention in the Sung; Ta-hui's interest certainly reflects and represents a wider trend in Sung Buddhism and in the Sung Ch'an school particularly.

In this chapter we wish to explore Ta-hui's use of examples and language taken from the Hua-yen sūtra in his teachings, particularly his teaching of laymen. We also wish to suggest a possible link between Ta-hui's enthusiasm for the teachings of the sūtra, his willingness to take the world as his parish, and his belief that all men, including laymen, should be taught to practice toward enlightenment.

A. Ta-hui's View of Lay Practice

First let us look briefly at Ta-hui's teachings on the question of practice in a monastery vs. practice in lay life. In India, Buddhism

in its beginnings had taught that abandoning one's worldly ties was the preferred way to seek Buddhahood. One could not attain Buddhahood while harboring desire for any worldly satisfaction; the training that could put an end to such desire could best be practiced by symbolically and physically cutting oneself off from the normal practices of life. The first step toward overcoming desires for good food, fine clothes, sexual satisfaction, wealth, health, and worldly preeminence was to leave the world which counted these its greatest gifts. So much greater were one's chances for progress on the path to enlightenment, if one were to leave "the world" behind and enter monastic life that to enter the sangha was a deed that earned great merit, and to pursue the disciplined practice of the sangha earned even more.[1] This difference of relative merit between actions as a laymen, however virtuous, and actions according to the vinaya rules that governed monastic conduct made the monastic order a "field of merit" in which laymen could earn merit for themselves by supporting the efforts of the monks.

Ta-hui subscribed in a conventional way to this orthodox view, and brought it up very occasionally in his letters and sermons whenever it seemed to fit the case or meet the expectations of his hearers. For example, of one lay sponsor of a sermon who had come to live and practice alongside the monks in a monastery Ta-hui said:

> Because he knew that the empty phantasms of this world were not real, he jumped out of the fire grate (the world) and came [to the monastery] in order to cultivate [himself] through the Buddhist

---

1. In this study the term sangha, in conformity with Chinese usage, will be used to refer only to the Buddhist sangha of monks and nuns.

> Way apart from the world....Two years ago he often came up [to this monastery], wanting to follow a teacher and study the Dharma that goes beyond the world. Despite his wealth and status, he was willing to come here to carry dung and grow vegetables. This man is the world's greatest seeker of his own advantage![1]

But the real thrust of Ta-hui's teaching is the view that appears in later, Mahāyāna, Buddhism, that such retreat to monastic or retired life, while helpful if convenient, is unnecessary: wisdom can be cultivated and enlightenment achieved in any worldly or monastic circumstances. Ta-hui asserts that it is not physically leaving the world that matters, but mentally going beyond the world in a moment of enlightenment.[2] It is one's habits of mind, not one's outward circumstances, that obstruct the path to enlightenment:

> The affairs of the world of sentient beings don't require study. From beginningless time their habits have ripened and matured....What requires tenacious effort is setting [these habits] aside. But as for the wisdom beyond the world, from beginningless time you have set yourself against it, so that now when you hear a teacher preaching, you naturally can't understand what he is saying.[3]

The remedy is likewise to alter one's mental habits, not to reject certain objects of perception:

> You must be fully determined to contend [with the bad habits of your mind] to the end....If you deeply [determine to cultivate wisdom], then...all of the devils and heresies [of worldly mind] will

---

1. P'u Shuo, p. 412a.

2. This reminds one of Chang Shang-ying's rebuttal to Ch'eng I's criticism that although Buddhists talk about "leaving the world," it is impossible to leave the world. Cf. Ch. III, p. 123, fn. 2.

3. Letters, p. 32.

> naturally hide and disappear of themselves, you won't need to send them away. It is a question of making the ripe [worldly habits] unripe, and the unripe [habits of wisdom] ripe, not of rejecting one or the other.[1]

To make progress on the path one must "leave the world" only in the sense that one realizes the inability of what the world has to offer to satisfy one's real needs. This is a particularly difficult thing for privileged shih-tai-fu to accomplish, and therefore is especially to be praised in those who accomplish it.[2] The reason for this Ta-hui sketches using Buddhist technical concepts, shun and ni 順 逆, "with" and "against." Our six organs of perception encounter a myriad of objects of sensation that either please or displease, either accord "with" our wishes or go "against" them. For ordinary men the quantity of sensations that displease is vastly larger than the quantity that please, so that a decision not to place one's hopes in worldly satisfactions is relatively easy to reach. Ta-hui repeatedly points out that for successful and wealthy shih-tai-fu the opposite is true; many shih-tai-fu can coast through a lifetime feeling that most things are right with the world.[3] This is of course an illusion from which shih-tai-fu will eventually awaken, but it is one that can last several lifetimes, causing men to waste their precious opportunity for enlightenment.

---

1. Letters, p. 32.

2. E.g., cf. P'u Shuo, p. 412a; P'u Shuo, p. 454a.

3. P'u Shuo, p. 438a-b.

Once one has resolved to "leave the world" in this sense, one may or may not choose to practice the path as a monk or a layman living in retirement. One can also find the path that leads "beyond the world" in the midst of one's daily activities "within the world." For Ta-hui, the important thing is to realize that one does not transcend worldly dharmas by leaving them behind, or rejecting them. One must not try to destroy the forms of the world in order to reach a vision of the "reality" which transcends or lies behind these mere manifestations.[1] The dharmas of the world are the Buddha's Dharma,[2] and one will get nowhere at all in practicing the path until one recognizes this. One's aim is not to avoid the forms of this world, but rather not to be limited by them. Ta-hui writes to a lay disciple:

> You say that in your youth, and throughout your career as an official, you have visited all the great masters [of the Ch'an sect], but that during that time because of the pressure of examinations, marriage and office, and also because of the triumph of evil perceptions and habits, you haven't been able to practice the Buddhist Way purely and singlemindedly. You see this as a great fault, and reflect painfully that among the various impermanent and empty phantasms of this world there is not one that gives real happiness. You [now] want to investigate this one great [Truth] with undivided mind. This pleases me exceedingly.
>
> Now since you have been a scholar-official, you've naturally had to look to an official salary to provide your livelihood; examinations, marriage and official posts have been unavoidable for you. All of this is not something you should blame yourself for....What you consider a fault could not have been avoided even by the sages and men of

---

1. P'u Shuo, p. 445a.

2. P'u Shuo, p. 449a; Letters, p. 122.

> great virtue. If you only keep in mind that the empty phantasms [of this world] are not ultimate dharmas, and turn toward this teaching, and use the water of wisdom to wash away the accumulated dirt and stains [from whatever has been wrong in your worldly conduct], so that you abide purely and cleanly in yourself, and then right where you are put forth the sword of wisdom ...and don't give rise to mental continuity--that is enough.[1]
>
> Each man in his daily life must not reject or despise [karmic] causes and effects (i.e., the conditions of his own life with its responsibilities), but practice bravely and vigorously, setting aside the dreams, hallucinations and empty flowers of this world, and [figuratively] taking up the staff of the monk. Then he will not be limited by the forms of this world.[2]

The dangerous thing to do is to "reject or destroy the forms of this world in order to find reality."[3] This is to miss the truth altogether, and create an unreal dichotomy. For that reason Ta-hui says that it is vastly preferable to remain a layman than to entertain the deluded notion that one could reach enlightenment more successfully as a monk.

Monastic life is conducive to enlightenment, because monks hear, read and think only about the Buddhist Dharma, and engage in only such activities as lead toward enlightenment. But for this very reason laymen, who have so many distractions to contend with, actually achieve a deeper and stronger enlightenment than a monk because of the greater obstacles in their path.[4]

---

1. Letters, pp. 6-7.

2. P'u Shuo, p. 421b.

3. P'u Shuo, p. 445a.

4. Yü-lu, Taishō 47, p. 900a.

B. Evidence of Ta-hui's Special Interest in the Hua-yen sūtra

Ta-hui may have found confirmation for this positive view of lay practice in the universalism which is a major feature of the teachings of the Buddha recorded in the Hua-yen sūtra.[1] Ta-hui's great interest in this sūtra can be seen early in his career. Perhaps it began when he visited Chang Shang-ying in Hupei in 1116 and again in 1120.[2]

Chang Shang-ying was a very learned Buddhist layman who had a great interest in the Hua-yen sūtra. Early in his life he read the works of all of the teachers of the Hua-yen school.[3] Not content with that, in 1088 he visited the place where the T'ang dynasty scholar of Hua-yen, Li T'ung-hsüan (Li Ch'ang-che)'s memorial stele had been erected, and found there in an abandoned ruin of a house a text in four chüan by Li T'ung-hsüan called Hua-yen chüeh-i lun 華嚴決疑論 (A Treatise on the Resolution of Doubts on the Avataṃsaka).[4] On reading this work Chang Shang-ying experienced a breakthrough in his understanding of Buddhism: he records in his Chüeh-i lun hou-chi 決疑論後記 that he read Li T'ung-hsüan's

---

1. Hua-yen sūtra 華嚴經, a translation into Chinese of the Avataṃsaka sūtra. See below.

2. See Chapter I above. It is interesting that Chang Shang-ying's Hu-fa lun (see footnote 2, p. 123) argued that lay Buddhism was the true Mahāyāna Buddhism, on the basis of the Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa, and defended Buddhism by citing the Ch'an school's requirement of work from monks. Cf. Andō Tomonobu, "Chō Sho-ei no Gohōron to sono haikei," Ōtani Gakuhō, XLII, No. 3 (January, 1963), p. 30.

3. Andō Tomonobu, "Sō no Chō Sho-ei ni tsuite," Tōhōgaku, XXII (July, 1961), p. 61.

4. Andō, "Sō no Chō Sho-ei," p. 61. This work is in Taishō 36, pp. 1011c-1048c.

work like a madman and that his doubts were suddenly resolved.[1] In addition to the Chüeh-i lun hou-chi, Chang Shang-ying also wrote an inscription about Li T'ung-hsüan's life called Li Chang-che kan chi 李長者龕記.[2] This discovery of a work by Li Chang-che was a very significant contribution to Sung Buddhism. It also apparently greatly increased the impact of the Hua-yen sūtra and the Hua-yen school on Chang Shang-ying's thinking. Chang also invited the monk Kuang-chih Ta-shih Pen-sung 廣智大師本嵩 to give lectures on the Hua-yen fa-chieh kuan 華嚴法界觀.[3] These lectures were recorded as the Chu Hua-yen fa-chieh kuan-men sung 註華嚴法界觀門頌,[4] a work whose sponsorship has earned Chang considerable credit, since it was an important addition to the literature on the Avataṃsaka. Chang also mentions in his Hu-fa lun[5] great admiration for

---

1. Ibid; this work is in Taishō 36, pp. 1048c-1049c.

2. This inscription is included in Lu Yao-yü, ed., Chin-shih hsü-pien (Facsimile reproduction; Taipei: Kuo-feng ch'u-pan-she, 1965), chuan 17, p. 4a-b (p. 401).

3. Andō, "Sō no Chō Sho-ei," p. 61. The Hua-yen fa-chieh kuan is attributed to Tu Shun, but was probably in fact written down by his disciple Chih-yen. Cf. Kamata Shigeo, Chūgoku Kegon shisōshi no kenkyū (Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Tōyōbunka Kenkyūjo, 1965), p. 59.

4. Ibid. Now in Taishō 45, pp. 692c-707c.

5. See above, Chapter III. Andō Tomonobu makes a case for this having definitely been written by Chang Shang-ying (a point challenged by Ch'en Yüan) and having been written in the period from 1112 to 1121 when Chang was living in retirement. Andō argues for this time period partly because he sees the treatise as a response to Hui Tsung's unfavorable treatment of Buddhism during that period. Andō also sees the Hua-yen ideas of "perfect harmony and no obstruction" as the theoretical basis of the "Three Teachings thought" expressed in Chang's Hu-fa lun ("Chō Sho-ei no Gohōron to sono haikei," pp. 29-40).

Li Chang-che.[1] Chang's association in people's minds with Li T'ung-hsüan was so great it was commonly said that he was a reincarnation of the great T'ang scholar.[2]

We are not told whether Ta-hui studied Hua-yen teachings during his eight-month stay in Chang's home in 1120. But in Ta-hui's later life, the period in which sermons were recorded and letters preserved, we find frequent quotations from Li T'ung-hsüan in his sermons and writings.[3] It is probable that his interest in the T'ang Hua-yen scholar was aroused or strengthened by his association with Chang Shang-ying, an association which clearly had a formative impact on his life and which he frequently mentioned in later years.

Between the end of 1120 when he left Chang Shang-ying and 1125 when he was enlightened under Yüan-wu's tutelage, the official chronology of Ta-hui's life mentions two incidents involving the Hua-yen sūtra. The first was when Ta-hui made friends based on common interests with a layman who came to Ta-hui's monastery to borrow a copy of the Hua-yen sūtra.[4] The second was in 1124. In that year, as recounted in Chapter I above, Ta-hui despaired of ever finding any truth in Ch'an. To atone for this doubt, he copied out by hand a section of a commentary on the Hua-yen sūtra by Ch'eng-kuan and took it as an offering to Yüan-wu's T'ien-ning Ssu.[5] Apparently in these years after his visit to Chang Shang-ying,

---

1. Taishō 52, p. 645b.

2. Andō, "Sō no Chō Sho-o ni tsuite," p. 61.

3. See footnote 5, p. 231, and footnote 3, p. 233.

4. Nien-p'u, p. 4b.

5. Nien-p'u, p. 5a. This was probably the Hua-yen sui-shu yen-i ch'ao 華嚴隨疏演義鈔 (cf. Letters, pp. 217-18; and Kamata, Chūgoku Kegon shisōshi, p. 204).

Ta-hui engaged in some serious study not only of the Hua-yen sūtra but also of the Chinese Hua-yen school of which Ch'eng-kuan was a leading representative.

In 1128, when Ta-hui was living at Hu-ch'iu, he spent the summer reading the Hua-yen sūtra again. During this reading he had an experience of breakthrough to a deeper understanding and a deeper level of samādhi.[1] It may have been this experience which earned the Hua-yen sūtra a central place among the sūtras upon which Ta-hui drew for inspiration and clarification of doctrine.

In addition to frequent quotations from the Hua-yen sūtra in sermons and letters, we find other clues to Ta-hui's interest in this sūtra throughout his life. For example, in 1146 one of his lay disciples copied out a section of the Hua-yen sūtra and presented it to Ta-hui at the temple where Ta-hui was living in exile.[2] Ta-hui had a special

---

1. According to the Nien-p'u, Ta-hui reported that he was reading the description of the entrance of the Bodhisattva into the eighth bhūmi (ti-pa pu-tung ti 第八不動地), in which all discriminations cease and the Bodhisattva gives rise to a powerful spirit of courage to save all beings. The passage Ta-hui was reading is quoted at length in the Nien-p'u; it appears in Taishō 10, p. 199a, lines 11-28. Ta-hui is quoted as saying: "when I read this far, I broke out of the cloth bag, and suddenly all the upāya that Chan T'ang had mentioned appeared (and became my own) (Nien-p'u, p. 6a-b). In a sermon, Ta-hui tells the same story, adding: "From this time on...I preached...without any reliance on sūtras or texts. When students came before me, I didn't need to wait for them to reveal themselves in order to know whether they were correct or not" (P'u Shuo, p. 459b). In another sermon in which Ta-hui tells the same story, he adds: "My being able to trust my mouth to preach began at that time" (P'u Shuo, p. 421a). For a discussion of the accomplishments of the Bodhisattva at the seventh and eighth bhūmi, see Kizow Inazu, "Final Stage of Religious Awakenment [sic] expressed in the 7th and 8th Grade of Bodhisattva," JIBS, XVIII, No. 2 (March, 1970), pp. 1043-54.

2. Nien-p'u, p. 11b.

display case prepared for it in the abbot's quarters of the temple. In 1149, he wrote a letter to Li Kuang recommending that he read the Hua-yen sūtra.[1] In 1154 a lay disciple sponsored a Hua-yen assembly and invited Ta-hui to preach.[2] In a sermon Ta-hui mentioned that he was reading the Hua-yen sūtra yet another time when a woman lay disciple asked him to give her a Dharma name, so he chose one from the Hua-yen sūtra.[3] His explanation of the source of the title "P'u Shuo" for his favorite sermon form pointed, as has been mentioned in Chapter V above, to a section of the Hua-yen sūtra in which the term "p'u shuo" is used.[4] In the last year of his life he read the Hua-yen sūtra at a great gathering to pray for the welfare of the country.[5] Finally, he quoted frequently from Ts'ung-mi, the great T'ang Ch'an teacher and theorist who was also recognized as the fifth and last patriarch in the Hua-yen school's line of transmission.[6]

Taken together with Ta-hui's frequent use of quotations from the sūtra, these signs of special interest indicate an unusual affinity for the work spanning a lifetime, particularly when one realizes that no other sūtra received this kind of special interest. While other sūtras

---

1. Letters, p. 12a.

2. Nien-pu, p. 12b.

3. P'u Shuo, p. 440b.

4. See Chapter V above, pp. 188-90.

5. Nien-p'u, p. 15b.

6. Ts'ung-mi is quoted by Ta-hui in P'u Shuo, pp. 414b, 446b, 455a, 468b; and Letters, pp. 88-90, 148-50, among other places.

were quoted in his writings, no other sūtra gave its name to an assembly with which Ta-hui was associated, was copied by Ta-hui or any of his disciples, or was read by Ta-hui at a public gathering.

C. A Brief Look at the Hua-yen sūtra and the Hua-yen School

What might it have been that attracted Ta-hui especially to the study of the Hua-yen sūtra and the teachings of the Hua-yen school? To answer that question we must take a brief look at the teachings of the sūtra and the school. The Hua-yen (Avataṃsaka, "Flower Garland") sūtra, a massive work which has not yet been translated into any European language, was translated twice into Chinese, once in about 420 A.D., by Buddhabhadra, and again in about 699 A.D. by Śiksānanda. The origins of the sūtra are unclear, and Sanskrit originals no longer exist for a large part of the work. Many scholars believe that most of the separate chapters which now make up the larger work were written in central Asia or even in China, as they include place names from those regions. It is thought by some that at some time after the 2nd century A.D., a compiler or group of compilers, inspired by the two chapters for which Sanskrit originals have been found, the Gaṇḍavyūha and the Daśabhūmika, put together separate sūtras into the one Avataṃsaka in such a way as to furnish a very detailed description of the progress of the Bodhisattva from the time he began his practice until the moment of his complete and perfect enlightenment.[1]

---

1. Cf. Nakamura Hajime, "Kegonkyō no shisōshiteki igi (The Significance of the Buddhāvatamsaka in the World History of Ideas)," in Kawada Kumatarō and Nakamura Hajime, eds., Kegon shisō (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1960), pp. 90-95. A more detailed account can be found in Ishii Kyōdō, Kegon kyōgaku seiritsu shi (Tokyo: Chūō Koron Jigyō Shuppan, 1964).

As with other sūtras, it is divided into a series of assemblies at which the Buddha or a Bodhisattva, often Mañjuśrī (Wen Shu 文殊) or Samantabhadra (P'u Hsien 普賢), addresses a meeting of Bodhisattvas and Śrāvakas. The times, locales, speakers and audiences of these assemblies have symbolic meanings as well as literal ones. For example, the first assembly at the "Place of the Truth of Stillness and Extinction (Nirvāṇa)" takes place on earth immediately after Buddha's enlightenment. In it the Buddha describes the moment of first achieving enlightenment. Samantabhadra is the speaker who praises the Buddha in this assembly. In this sūtra he is the chief Bodhisattva and stands both for the highest truth and for true practice. The second assembly also takes place on earth at the same place and time and represents the beginning of the Buddha's preaching of the Dharmadhātu[1] that he has experientially proved. In this assembly Mañjuśrī, who stands for the wisdom of Emptiness (Prajña), appears, and preaches faith purified by wisdom, and wisdom deepened by faith. For the third assembly the locale is shifted to the Heavens, where Samantabhadra is again the speaker, and so forth.[2] As in the more familiar Lotus Sūtra, each shift of

1. Dharmadhātu has two meanings when used in the sūtra and the school. When dhātu is taken to mean the nature of dharmas, Dharmadhātu is equivalent to dharmatā or tathatā (suchness). When dhatū is taken as meaning "world," "realm" or "boundary," Dharmadhātu refers to the cosmos as a whole (cf. Hee Sung Keel, "Chinul, the Founder of the Korean Sŏn [Zen] Tradition [unpublished dissertation, Harvard University, 1977], p. 37; and Takakusu, p. 113). Dharmadhātu can also be plural, meaning many Dharma-realms. When the context indicates that Ta-hui is using it in the plural, I have translated it as "Dharma-realms."

2. Cf. Kawada Kumatarō, "Budda kegon (Wreath of Buddha)," in Kawada and Nakamura, Kegon shisō, pp. 21-26; and Yamada Ryōken, "Kegon kyōgaku in okeru shin no ichi," in Nihon Bukkyō Gakkai, eds., Bukkyō ni okeru shin no mondai (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1963), pp. 260-63.

locale and speaker can be interpreted as representing symbolically a shift in the nature or level of profundity of the truth taught according to the degree of wisdom of the audience addressed. Many different teachings, such as "Emptiness" and "Mind Only," appear in this sūtra, of which a full summary would be impossible here.

Most central perhaps are the themes of the unity and universality of the truth to which the Buddha is enlightened, the Dharmadhātu which is the ground of all things. For example, in the opening chapters we are told that the name of the Buddha is infinite, and so are his merits. The names of the Buddha's fundamental teachings, the four noble truths, are infinite, and although their names differ from world to world, their meanings do not differ. The Light of the Tathāgata illumines three thousand great thousands of worlds; it is infinite. (In Fa-tsang's commentary on this point, he says, the light from the Buddha's person illumines 3000 realms of phenomena (shih 事), while the light of the wisdom of Manjusri illumines the realm of Principle (Li 理). (Shih and Li are Chinese terms not found in the sūtra). The Dharmadhātu (fa-chieh 法界) is limitless and the gates of the Dharma (fa-men 法門) are limitless.[1]

Infinite, innumerable, limitless, one, penetrating and containing everything in all directions in time and space, miraculously creative and powerful in all directions at once, such is the Dharmadhātu. By its power one part of the whole truly seen reveals every other part. The unity, universality, mutual inclusiveness and equality of all

1. Cf. Yamada Ryōken, "Kegon kyōgaku ni okeru shin no ichi," pp. 264-67.

he got up, he thought: "This great palace is the place where those who are released into emptiness, without form and without desire, dwell. It is the place where those who don't distinguish among all *dharmas* dwell. It is the place where those who use one *kalpa* to enter all *kalpas*, and all *kalpas* to enter one *kalpa*, and do not harm their forms, dwell. It is the place where those who by means of one Buddha include all Buddhas, and by means of all Buddhas include one Buddha, and don't destroy their forms, dwell."[1] In this way he praised the palace with unimaginable numbers of thousands of words.

Why did he not enter the palace? Because he knew that there were things inside of unsurpassed splendor. In the future he would know that the things of the time before he entered were identical to the things inside.

Then he saw Maitreya Bodhisattva coming from another place....He said, "I only desire the great sage to open the gate of the palace and let me enter."[2] Then Maitreya Bodhisattva pointed to the palace. He snapped his fingers, and a sound came forth and the gate opened. He commanded Sudhana to enter. Sudhana's heart was joyful; after he entered, the gate closed. When he reached the center of the palace, he saw a measureless, boundless, incomprehensible self-existent realm. Then Maitreya Bodhisattva entered the palace, and, snapping his fingers again, said to Sudhana, "Good youth, giving rise to the Dharma-Nature is like this. This is the wisdom of the Bodhisattvas that knows all *dharmas*. Cause and effect assemble the forms you see, which are like magic, like a dream, like shadow, like images, all are not established."[3]

When Sudhana heard the sound of the fingers snapping, he awoke from *samādhi* and asked Maitreya Bodhisattva, "Where did these beautiful things go?"[4] The Bodhisattva replied, "Back to where they came from." Sudhana asked again,

---

1. *Taishō* 10, p. 423a.

2. *Taishō* 10, p. 435a.

3. *Taishō* 10, p. 437c.

4. *Taishō* 10, p. 438a.

> "Where did they come from?" [The Bodhisattva] replied: "They came from the magical power of the wisdom of the Bodhisattva. They depend on the magical powers of the Bodhisattva in order to abide, and there is no place they could go, and also no place where they could abide. Not empty and not permanent, they are far removed from everything."[1]

Maitreya then sends Sudhana to see the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī, under ose tutelage Sudhana began the journey. Mañjuśrī makes a rather dden appearance by reaching out his hand to Sudhana from a distance one hundred and ten yojanas.[2]

Under Mañjuśrī's tutelage Sudhana experiences a further degree of lightenment. In one thought he sees the innumerable teachers of the 00 worlds, and approaches and pays homage to them all.[3] He receives eir teaching and obtains new forms of release (vimokṣa).

Finally Sudhana sees Samantabhadra, who touches Sudhana's head make him obtain the final samādhis.[4] He even enters a pore on mantabhadra's body, and within it takes one step. In that one step crosses inexpressible distances, innumerable worlds, and finds mself equal to all the Buddhas--indeed, all is equal in the moment.[5] is, as Ta-hui frequently pointed out, makes this young boy, a layman,

---

P'u Shuo, p. 420b. Cf. also P'u Shuo, p. 466b and p. 433a. Taishō), p. 438a.

Taishō 10, p. 439b.

Taishō 10, p. 439b.

Taishō 10, pp. 440a-41b.

Letters, p. 8. Taishō 10, p 442b. Ta-hui in his retelling makes ñjuśrī the Bodhisattva in this episode, not Samantabhadra.

one of three persons in the entire sūtra literature who actually obtain Buddhahood in the current birth.[1] But in a sense, Ta-hui says, the pilgrimage of Sudhana was completed at its beginning, for in One Thought of Enlightenment all subsequent realizations are contained:

> What exactly is meant by "this thought"? You remember that Sudhana in front of the temple to honor the ancient Buddhas in the east part of Dhanyākara saw Mañjuśrī....and with one thought proved [the truth of the Buddha's teaching].[2] In his later passing through 110 cities and visiting 53 teachers he did not go beyond this one thought. For when this one thought is produced, it fills all of space; this thought is so fast that even a flash of lightning can't equal it.[3]

It would be misleading to suggest that Ta-hui's main interest in the Gaṇḍavyūha is in the fact that Sudhana and many of his teachers are laymen. As we have seen, all aspects of the Bodhisattva path and of the power of the One Thought of Enlightenment taught in the Gaṇḍavyūha fascinated him. It would also be misleading to suggest that Ta-hui was attracted to the Hua-yen sūtra as a whole primarily because he could draw from it theoretical support for the possibility of bringing laymen to enlightenment through hua-t'ou practice. Ta-hui never argued this point in a theoretical fashion, but rather preached and acted on it; he was interested in scriptural references only as a means of persuasion in the dynamic situation of convincing laymen of what he thought

---

1. P'u Shuo, p. 458b.

2. This refers to Sudhana's first meeting with Mañjuśrī; c.f. Taishō 10, pp. 332a-34a.

3. P'u Shuo, p. 454a; cf. also p. 447a.

was obviously true. Nonetheless it does seem possible to suggest that Ta-hui's sense of mission reflected and grew out of a sense of the universality of the Dharmadhātu, and the Buddha-Nature, the practice of the Bodhisattva path, and the expedient means provided for the enlightenment of all in the Buddha's teaching. This vision of universality must have made convenient distinctions on the phenomenal plane, such as that between layman and monk, seem ultimately unimportant. Ta-hui's enthusiasm for the Hua-yen sūtra may in part reflect, or result from, the similarity between its universal vision and his own.

While this must remain in the realm of speculation, there are some clues that suggest that Ta-hui himself saw a connection between the teachings of this sūtra in particular and his own message that laymen should seek enlightenment in the midst of their own busy surroundings and while carrying out their daily tasks. Let us examine some of these clues.

As we have seen, one of the morals that Ta-hui draws from the story of Sudhana is the unity and universality of the Dharmadhātu and the One Thought of Enlightenment. He says to a layman:

> Now that you understand with certainty that the Dharma-realms of the Avatamsaka are definitely not empty words, don't make the mistake of thinking that there are other things apart from that Dharmadhātu. The ups and downs of luck, that which pleases and that which displeases, the correct and the heretical, all are not other [than the Dharmadhātu]. I want you always to see [the Dharmadhātu] this way. I also am a part of it.[1]

1. Letters, pp. 159-60; cf. also P'u Shuo, p. 455a.

Another point that Ta-hui finds in the sūtra is the equality of all dharmas:

> In the Hua-yen Sūtra it says: Dharmas are equal, there is no higher or lower. This is called Anuttarā-samyaksambodhi.[1]

The Hua-yen sūtra, Ta-hui says, tells us that the Buddha in his enlightenment realized that all beings were of the same essence (t'i) with him and equal to him and to each other.[2] Thus, says Ta-hui, the "worldly" is equal to the "holy", the deluded is equal to the enlightened, words are equal to silence, busy places ("the world") are equal to quiet ones (the monastery or other retreat).[3]

In the following passage Ta-hui makes a clear connection between the universality of the Dharmadhātu and the equality of Dharma and the fact that the Buddhist practice and enlightenment are everywhere, not only in the monastery:

> Sudhana standing in front of Maitreya's towering palace exclaimed: "this is where those who have left all of the nests of the world behind live."[4] What are the "nests of the world"? They are those things that obstruct the peerless Way. If you are attached to "the nests of the world," you must not leave them behind by throwing them away. Those of us that are called teachers mustn't live in monasteries and cut ourselves off from the world in order to practice the Way. If one does this, that is to destroy the forms of this world in order to talk about the real phenomena.[4]

---

1. P'u Shuo, p. 460b.

2. P'u Shuo, p. 427b.

3. Letters, pp. 24-25.

4. Taishō 10, p. 423a.

Ta-hui notes that the Hua-yen sūtra says that all who have bodhicitta (Mind of Enlightenment) will become Buddhas:[1] for Ta-hui, that emphatically must include laymen. Further, Ta-hui interprets the Buddha's teachings in the Hua-yen sūtra as saying that one should accept one's own karmically determined circumstances and practice within those circumstances; the Buddha will use one's karmically determined circumstances, whatever they may be, to bring one to enlightenment.[2]

Further, Ta-hui's own sense of universal mission finds inspiration and confirmation in the Hua-yen sūtra. In that sūtra we are told that the Buddha enlightens all beings in every walk of life in all of the Dharma-realms:

> The Buddha in his great compassion and grandmotherly kindness enters into all of the [myriad] worlds of all the Dharma realms,...and one by one through the dream of self-existence shows Dharma-gates and causes the numberless sentient beings of the innumerable worlds to awaken, and causes those in wrong samādhis to enter the assembly of correct samādhi.[3]

The Buddha in pursuing this goal in no way confines himself to a realm separate from the phenomena of this world; he does not hold himself apart from the world created by karma. The Tathāgata doesn't preserve his own nature, but follows karmic causes and completes all things.

---

1. Letters, p. 73. Taishō 10, p. 72c; cf. also p. 76a.

2. Letters, p. 109.

3. Letters, p. 176; cf. P'u Shuo, p. 482b. Ta-hui here paraphrases a portion of the Ju-lai hsien-hsiang-p'in 如來現相品 of the Hua-yen sūtra, found in the Taishō 10, p. 29a-b.

> The original Buddha-Nature follows karmic causes and responds, it goes everywhere and doesn't ever leave the seat of enlightenment (bodhi).[1]

E. Ta-hui and the Hua-yen School

Ta-hui's recorded sayings, letters and sermons show familiarity with the works of three Hua-yen teachers: Li Tung-hsüan,[2] Ch'eng-kuan[3] and Ts'ung-mi. They also contain evidence of his familiarity with doctrines of the Hua-yen school. For example, he refers frequently to the Avataṃsaka sūtra as the "One Vehicle Round and Sudden Teaching" as was done in the Hua-yen school.[4] He also refers frequently to the statement of Li T'ung-hsüan that the Buddha certainly taught the Hua-yen sūtra ten days after his enlightenment,[5] and to the Hai-yin (Sāgaramudrā) Samādhi in which the Buddha preached the teachings contained in the sūtra.[6] From these clues it can be seen that Ta-hui accepted the Hua-yen

---

1. Letters, pp. 24-25. The original passage in the Hua-yen sūtra reads:

> "The Buddha's body fills the Dharmadhātu and universally appears before all sentient begins. The Buddha follows karmic causes and responds everywhere, and throughout remains on the seat of enlightenment" (Taishō 10, p. 30a).

2. In addition to the references listed in fn. 5 below and fn. 3, p. 32, Ta-hui once refers to Li T'ung-hsüan's Chüeh-i lun by name as the source of a statement about the strong faith of women. Cf. P'u Shuo, p. 454a.

3. Cf. Nien-p'u, p. 5a, and Letters, p. 217-18 and 105.

4. P'u Shuo, pp. 445b and 445a.

5. P'u Shuo, p. 466a; 445a and p. 445b.

6. P'u Shuo, p. 460b.

school's estimate of the place of the Avatamsaka sūtra in the hierarchy of the Buddha's teachings, and not that of the rival T'ien T'ai school.[1] Moreover, echoing the Hua-yen school, he equates the Dharmadhātu (Miao chüeh ming yüan chao fa chieh 妙覺明圓照法界) with the Tathāgata-garbha.[2] Most important to him, however, were the teachings of the unity of all dharmas in one dharma, particularly in the "One Thought of Enlightenment." He frequently quotes the Hua-yen scholar Li T'ung-hsüan as saying:

> In the boundless myriad realms, self and other are not separated by a hair's tip. The ten worlds, present and past, finally from beginning to end do not depart from this present thought.[3]

He also frequently refers to the Hua-yen idea that all dharmas interpenetrate and appear in one dharma: the large can appear in the small, and the small in the large, and the unmoving place of the Way (pu-tung tao-ch'ang 不動道場) covers all the worlds of the ten directions.[4] All is equal to one and one to all, all the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas of the Hua-yen assembly appear together on the tip of a hair,[5] and in one thought-moment one can see them all clearly. Ta-hui also frequently refers to the metaphor of Li 理 (Principle) and Shih 事 (phenomena). Among his favorite phrases is a statement, "Principle (Li) follows phenomena in changing, and phenomena obtain

---

1. Takakusu, p. 116.
2. P'u Shuo, p. 470a; cf. Takakusu, p. 114.
3. P'u Shuo, pp. 461a, 460a, 454a.
4. P'u Shuo, p. 445a.
5. P'u Shuo, p. 458a.

Principle in harmonizing [blending]."[1] He also refers to the idea that phenomena and phenomena are mutually non-obstructing (shih-shih-wu-ai 事事無礙).[2]

As in the case of the Hua-yen sūtra, Ta-hui again draws a moral which applies these teachings of the Hua-yen school to the question of "leaving the world" vs. practicing in the midst of daily affairs. Enlightenment (as Li) and worldly affairs (as shih) are inseparable. In a metaphor that must have reminded the hearer of Fa-tsàng's famous golden lion, Ta-hui says:

> An ancient said, 'This [enlightenment] is the living intention of the patriarchs. What could bind and hold it?' If one leaves daily activities and goes somewhere else to look for it, then that is to leave the waves to look for the water, to leave the [gold] vessel to look for the gold; the more one seeks, the farther away one is from [what one is seeking].[3]

---

1. P'u Shuo, p. 445a; p. 470a.
2. Letters, p. 34; P'u Shuo, p. 470a.
3. Letters, pp. 50-52.

Chapter VII: Hua-t'ou Practice:

The Need for Hua-t'ou

A. Ta-hui's Emphasis on Hua-t'ou Practice

Ta-hui is remembered most by his descendants in the Ch'an and Japanese Zen traditions for his contributions to the development of hua-t'ou or kung-an (kōan) practice. Ta-hui held that a moment of awakening (wu, satori) was essential to true Ch'an practice, and that this moment of awakening could be experienced if one were able for an instant to be free of thought. The path to such an instant of freedom from all thought was, Ta-hui believed, fraught with pitfalls. For this reason, said Ta-hui, teachers of old had developed a means (upāya, fang-pien 方便), the hua-t'ou, to enable students to avoid pitfalls and bring their minds to a condition of readiness for the moment of awakening to its true Nature.

Ta-hui did not originate hua-t'ou practice; his contribution rather was to teach for the first time a theory and a method that explained how and why the hua-t'ou should be used in Ch'an practice. Hua-t'ou practice grew out of the teaching methods of early Ch'an teachers. As Ruth Fuller Sasaki relates:

> In the mountain monasteries where they preferred to live, the early Chinese Ch'an masters were in intimate contact with their disciples....While master and monks were picking tea, planting trees, or sitting around the fire together, the master, by means of a simple question about something in the immediate situation, would indicate to the disciple some aspect of the immutable Principle, bringing him to a deeper realization, or test the depth of understanding he had already achieved....From time to time the masters took the high seat in the main

> hall of the monastery and gave lectures to the assembly of monks....When they gave their own views, these were apt to be expressed in cryptic statements and formulas. At such times members of the community and any visiting monks and laymen who might be present were free to ask the master for further elucidation. They were also free to ask him questions of their own, or to bring up one of the numerous stereotyped questions that Zen adherents seemed always to have at hand when they had nothing else to inquire about.[1]

Such exchanges, even when the questions and answers were often repeated formulas, did not constitute a self-conscious hua-t'ou practice. The development of hua-t'ou practice using kung-an required several further steps. The first, Sasaki suggests, came when the number of monks studying under one master became larger. Unable to observe in daily living all of the monks under his instruction, the master might give to a group of monks a question he had previously found effective. Such a question had been addressed to a former disciple and had arisen out of his immediate situation, but it did not arise out of the immediate situations of the students to whom it was now given. These questions had the functions of hua-t'ou, but were not kung-an in the full sense of the word because they were questions being used by the masters who had originally created them.[2]

A distinction must be drawn between the terms hua-t'ou and kung-an. A kung-an is a "public case," an exchange, anecdote or formula adopted from an earlier teacher in the tradition. A hua-t'ou is a kung-an or a

---

1. Ruth Fuller Sasaki, "The History of the Koan in Rinzai (Lin-chi) Zen," in Isshū Miura and Ruth Fuller Sasaki, The Zen Koan (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1965), pp. 8-9.

2. Sasaki, "The History of the Koan," pp. 9-10.

part of a kung-an that can be taken as a subject of introspection and, as such, can be used to focus the mind in a particular way which is conducive to enlightenment.

Hua-t'ou practice using kung-an in its fully developed form was the use of the words of earlier masters in a fixed or systematized form to instruct a student or to test the depth of his realization. Sasaki points to the act of Nan-yüan Hui-yung 南院慧顒 (d. 930) in his questioning of a disciple about certain of Lin-chi's often-repeated formulas as the earliest recorded example of this practice.[1]

Not very long after Nan-yüan's death, collections of kung-an began to be made, and teachers began to draw upon them regularly as instructional material. Some masters added their own "alternate answers" to the kung-an of older teachers, or appended verses epitomizing the meaning of the kung-an in poetical language. Ta-hui's teacher Yüan-wu added his own commentary to one of the most influential of such kung-an collections, Hsüeh-tou's Po-tse sung-ku 百則頌古, thus creating the famous Pi-yen lu 碧巖錄 (Blue Cliff Records). As has been mentioned in Chapter I, Ta-hui also compiled a kung-an collection and with a friend wrote verses on other kung-an.[2]

Ta-hui's great contribution, however, was to instruct his students in how to use certain kung-an as hua-t'ou as an object of introspection through which one could mobilize the energies of the mind to bring to an end the usual streams of consciousness and see into the Essence of

---

1. Sasaki, "The History of the Koan," p. 10.

2. See pp. 26 and 31-32.

Mind itself. As hua-t'ou (sometimes called kōan) practice became the most important teaching method of the Lin-chi and Japanese Rinzai schools of Ch'an or Zen, so did the theoretical and practical understanding of hua-t'ou practice which Ta-hui offered in his letters and sermons become the "orthodox," traditional and central understanding of hua-t'ou practice. There were later additions, but the central core which Ta-hui contributed was repeatedly reaffirmed by teachers such as Chung-feng Ming-pen 中峰明本 (1263-1323) and Hakuin Ekaku 白隱慧鶴 (1686-1769), and forms the central understanding of Japanese Rinzai and Chinese Ch'an practice down to the present. Ta-hui's Letters remain a text frequently used in China, Korea and Japan to give students a basic understanding of how to conduct their hua-t'ou practice.[1]

Ta-hui's special emphasis on the need for hua-t'ou practice as the means (upāya) through which to gain enlightenment grew out of two concerns. The first was his concern for the ignorance of "educated" scholar-officials. The education they received in preparation for their civil service examinations and their future careers as bureaucrats taught them a great deal about everything except "the one thing needful," namely their own true Natures. What was worse, they considered their knowledge and cultivated rationality sufficient to their needs: they had learned to regard "learning" as the only important source of knowledge, and were only concerned to attain the degree of learning required

1. For example, Keel mentions that Ta-hui's Letters are an important part of the present curriculum given to students in the Korean Sŏn (Ch'an) "kangwon 講院 (monastic school)," and that its use in a Korean Sŏn curriculum dates back at least as far as the sixteenth century (Keel, p. 349).

by their status or their ambition. They settled all too easily for a purely theoretical understanding of truth.

Even more serious from Ta-hui's point of view, when "educated" scholar-officials, realizing the necessity of enlightenment to a freedom from self, came to Ch'an teachers to study the Way, their habits of mind and their intellectual ambitions made Ch'an practice toward enlightenment particularly difficult for them. Their tendency was to want to think, to debate, to attain some "truth" that would enhance their personal status; they were very frequently unwilling to give up the "rational" approach to the world in order to gain enlightenment. They had trained their minds to deal with words and concepts, to exegete texts in which "truth" was to be found. That there might be a truth that could not be understood by unravelling the meanings of words and concepts was difficult, in Ta-hui's experience, for them to accept or understand.

For these "maladies" of the scholar-official the _hua-t'ou_ seemed the most appropriate remedy. The scholar-official's rationality and learning could be overcome by arousing in him a doubt as to who he really was: was there in fact more to his being than rationality and learning and worldly success? In the inspection of the _hua-t'ou_, the unconscious doubts ("unfaiths," ignorances in the Buddhist sense) could become conscious and be focused on one point, one question. Since the question was not susceptible of an intellectual answer, the tendency to intellectualize could be overcome and the emotional energy hitherto given to maintaining the false "identity" of the self and avoiding personal truth could be used to break through the barriers of the self's concerns

and reveal the scholar-official's true Nature.

But Ta-hui's second great concern was that scholar-officials and other students of Ch'an were being prevented from employing the hua-t'ou upāya and were therefore not reaching enlightenment. Students were being misled by Ch'an teachers who advised them to take up ineffective and dangerous forms of practice: a leading example was the practice of "silent illumination" (mo-chao 默照) as taught by many "teachers" who had never themselves experienced enlightenment. To combat the attractions of these erroneous forms of practice Ta-hui tirelessly preached the necessity of wu 悟 (satori) and the virtues of the hua-t'ou upāya.

Ta-hui's insistence on the necessity of a moment of awakening and his stout defense of hua-t'ou practice as the effective means to enlightenment caused him to place a new emphasis on the importance of doubt in Ch'an practice. Many Ch'an masters before Ta-hui had stressed faith as an essential pre-condition of Ch'an practice, and had viewed doubt negatively as an impediment to faith. Some teachers such as Lin-chi had given to the concept "faith" the connotations of "Enlightened Mind" itself. Ta-hui did not deny the importance of faith on the path to enlightenment, but gave far greater emphasis to the important positive role that doubt can play in Ch'an practice if it is properly understood and focused.

In this chapter and the next we shall explore these aspects of Ta-hui's teaching concerning hua-t'ou practice, and include a summary of Ta-hui's instructions to lay students on how to conduct hua-t'ou practice in lay life. Ta-hui's conviction that hua-t'ou practice can be

carried out by laymen in the midst of their daily affairs, and his instructions on how this may be done, suggest that Ta-hui's insistence on the efficacy of hua-t'ou practice, and his excoriation of other ineffective practices and their teachers, may in large part have been motivated by his desire to make Ch'an practice truly available to laymen.

B. Misguided Education: Scholar-Official "Rationality" and Ch'an Practice.

As we have stated above, in the Sung dynasty the elite of the empire were men called shih-tai-fu. What distinguished shih-tai-fu from other men was that they either served in the government bureaucracy or were considered qualified to serve.[1] What enabled such men to qualify

1. Shiba Yoshinobu says: "The Sung official class whose economic foundation was the intensive and highly productive agriculture of their tenants, and who could gain access to official position only by means of success in the imperial examinations, differed from the aristocrats of the Six Dynasties and the subsequent period (i.e. from about A.D. 400-900), for whom rank and fortune were a hereditary birthright, in that as officials they had to make their own way by their own efforts and most of the privileges of status which they enjoyed did not descend to their children (Commerce and Society in Sung China, p. 202). The Sung shih-tai-fu were not "gentry" in the sense that the term is used to refer to the educated class of the Ming and Ch'ing. As Brian McKnight says: "In the Sung there were men with official status, there were various groups possessed of miscellaneous privileges, and there were the rich, but it seems fair to say that there were no gentry....(T)he gentry society of later times had not been born" (Village and Bureaucracy in Southern Sung China [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971], p. 6). The "gentry" of later times had hereditary influence regardless of wealth, had received Confucian educations, and had great influence on the local scene. In the Sung, scholar-officials were educated, but persons of local influence might merely be rich. The term shih-tai-fu, thus, refers only to those who were qualified for official posts, not to an as yet non-existent larger "gentry" from which such persons might be drawn. In the 1160's there were perhaps fifty to sixty million people in the territory governed by the Southern Sung; Kato Shigeru gives population figures for this decade of between eleven and thirteen million households (Shina keizaishi kōshō [Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko, 1953], II, pp. 318-19). Chin Yü-fu

to serve was primarily their education in what Ta-hui calls the "nine classics and the seventeen histories,"[1] an education which enabled them to pass the highly competitive civil service examinations.[2] In such an education one made an attempt to master the cultural legacy of philosophy, political philosophy, history, composition in prose and poetic forms, and calligraphy.[3]

---

estimates that there were between ten and twelve thousand non-military civil service personnel between 1165 and 1173 ("Sung-tai kuan-chih yü hsing-cheng chih-tu," Wen-shih tsa-chih, II, No. 4 [April, 1942], p. 21). For the Northern Sung, Kracke reaches a similar estimate of 25,000 civil and military officials for a population of sixty million (Kracke, Civil Service in Early Sung China, p. 55).

1. P'u Shuo, p. 442a. Cf. Also Kracke, "Region, Family and Individual in the Chinese Examination System," pp. 251-68.

2. Kracke has demonstrated the importance of the examinations as a route into office (Civil Service, esp. pp. 58-60 and 64-68; see also footnote 1 on page 10 above).

3. The content of the examinations varied during the Sung with the field chosen by the candidate. It was possible to be examined in letters, law, history, rituals, or classical study. The letters degree gradually became the most popular. It stressed reasoning and skill in composition in several kinds of prose and verse, but required attention also to history, ritual and ethics. This degree was called the chin-shih. Wang An-shih changed the content of the chin-shih examination to de-emphasize history and emphasize classics in the important first sections that determined whether a candidate passed (cf. Freeman, p. 142). Many people felt that the chin-shih exam in the Northern Sung gave too much weight to poetry as opposed to more "practical" subjects (cf. Kracke, Civil Service, pp. 61-64; Freeman, pp. 80-90). One of the results of the emphasis on the examination system in the Northern Sung was that the professional civil servants assumed leadership in all fields of scholarly and cultural activity touched upon by the examinations. Another result was the formation of a group of leaders with a background of intense training in accepted values and goals, with a resulting esprit de corps.

Such an education was a life's work, to be carried out intensively from the age of five or six until one passed the highest examination at perhaps thirty; thereafter a continuing effort was made throughout one's life to master the classics on a steadily deepening level. This was not merely an "academic" enterprise: rather it had the same importance in enabling one to be an effective official as mastery of the law has for a present-day American lawyer. Past thought and historical precedents were authorative, and must be cited when arguing any current policy question. One required a firm knowledge of the classics and histories in order to ground and bolster one's own position as well as anticipate the arguments and precedents cited by one's opponents.[1]

Furthermore, literary talent could not be brought to fruition without a thorough grounding in the classics. Literary ability, including elegant expression in memorials and official documents, was an essential string to an ambitious official's bow. It was only natural that mastery of the classics and histories should be something in which shih-tai-fu should have a large personal stake. Not only for the sake of their pride as members of the elite, but also for the sake of their effectiveness in their profession did scholar-officials seek mastery of the style and contents of the classics and histories.

What struck Ta-hui most as he observed the shih-tai-fu with whom he came in contact was that their education had fostered a rational approach to knowledge and understanding. This emphasis on the intelligent mind deflected them from achieving self-knowledge or developing

---

1. Freeman, p. 133-41.

virtuous or wise conduct, leading them instead to focus on mastery of detail and rational analysis. The consequences of this emphasis went beyond the personal; their effectiveness as governors and policy-makers was also affected.

Not only their education was at fault; their motivation in desiring to learn and understand was responsible at a deeper level for their mistaken attitudes in approaching learning. Precisely the fact that knowledge, and the reputation for having it, were so crucial to a shih-tai-fu's career meant that knowledge became associated with career-related fears and ambitions. The content of the classics was largely concerned with transcendent truth and its moral and political manifestation in man; the histories were interpreted as being concerned with what works and what does not work on the level of statecraft; the vast weight of the tradition was on the side of the view that it was the ethical virtue that worked and the unethical, the inhumane, that did not. The shih-tai-fu in theory was to gain from study of these records an awareness of his own faults that would enable him to correct them and perfect his character. But the fears, ambitions and other destructive attitudes associated with the reasons for learning prevented the content of what was being studied from occupying the shih-tai-fu's attention in a way that would enable it to inform the shih-tai-fu's character and actions in daily life and give him knowledge of himself in the light of the transcendent. Ta-hui says:

> I often say: shih-tai-fu are able to recite fluently all of the instances of flourishing, decline, good government, disorder, obedience, disobedience, heresy and truth in the nine classics and the seventeen histories of their

school. If there is one detail that they don't know, they consider that shameful, and are afraid others will laugh at them as not well educated.[1]

Dried-up scholar-officials spend a lifetime boring deeply into old paper wanting to know of the matters contained therein. They read widely a myriad of books, and engage in elevated talk and high-flown discussions. "What about Confucius? What about Mencius? Chuang-tzu said such-and-such, the Chou I 周易 [2] said so-and-so. What about good government and disorder in past and present?" They are manipulated by these words, and the result is that they talk a lot of confused nonsense. If they hear someone bring up just one word from the ancient philosophers and the hundred schools, they quickly recite the whole volume, and regard not knowing just one little detail as shameful.

But if you ask them about the affairs of their own hearth, there isn't a single one who knows. This can be called "to the end of one's days counting the jewels of others, but oneself having not even a half-penny." This is to go through a lifetime in this world in vain. When they are freed from this body, they don't know whether they are going to a heaven or to a hell, or will follow their karma's power and enter the stream of the various paths. But if [what you ask] concerns what goes on in others' homes, there is nothing big or small they don't know.[3]

Not only do the shih-tai-fu try to master the details of the classics and histories and then identify their own worth with that mastery, they also try to understand rationally the truths expounded in the books of the tradition. When challenged to demonstrate a grasp of the Way like

---

1. P'u Shuo, p. 416a.

2. The Chou I is of course the I Ching.

3. Letters, pp. 128-29.

that of the authors of the books they had "mastered," they are confounded:

> Nowadays intelligent scholar-officials studying Ch'an so often don't get anywhere. The problem is that they try to get somewhere by ratiocination. They say, "First think, and then you'll reach the stage of not thinking." So I must strike a blow when they have hardly opened their mouths. Some quote Chuang-tzu or Mencius and offer commentaries and explanations. Some quote [Chuang-tzu's] statement: "There is no place where the Way is not. All that you touch is the true Way. The Way is in the panic grass, in broken roof-tiles, in excrement and urine."[1] So I tell them, "Try to dig the Way out of a broken roof-tile. Dig me the Way out of excrement and urine." They can't reply to that.[2]

The result of confining themselves to rational appropriation is that the virtues that form the subject of their study never become their own: they remain "false," "mock-virtues" that like mock-turtle soup have the seeming without the being. Ta-hui says:

> If you examine the actions of [shih-tai-fu], [you find] that they aren't even up to the standard of an easy going, care-free fellow from a three-family village: riches and honor, poverty and base rank cannot confuse his mind. If you take this fellow and compare him to the shih-tai-fu, [you can see that] the wise is not the equal of the foolish, the man of high position not the equal of the man of low rank, in many cases.[3]

> When scholar-officials come to the crises of life and death, fortune and misfortune, the inadequacy of their self-cultivation is revealed in eight or nine out of

---

1. Chuang-tzu, chapter 22, Ssu-pu-pei-yao edition, chüan 7, p. 26a.

2. P'u Shuo, p. 410b.

3. Letters, p. 159.

> ten cases....Why? Because the moment when life and death, fortune and misfortune appear before one permits no artificiality or falsity.[1]

The problem lies in the fact that knowledge of truth has been pursued as an instrumental goal. The career of the scholar-official should, according to the classics, be motivated by a desire for personal virtue and a desire to govern for the benefit of the ruler, the state and the people. But the career of the _shih-tai-fu_ has become instead a pursuit of fame and profit for the individual. The more this kind of study and practice is pursued, the greater the ignorance, and the greater the false ego:

> Among scholar-officials, the ones who have studied more are more ignorant, the ones who have studied less are less ignorant. Those whose offices have been small have smaller egos; those whose offices have been great have greater egos. They say of themselves, "I am brilliant, I am incisive." But when they come up against a tiny bit of sharpness, their brilliance disappears, their shrewdness also disappears; out of all of the books they have studied in their lives, not a single word proves useful. Their mistake is that from the time they start to write, they only want wealth and positions for themselves.[2]

Wealth and position come not from ability to transform the world for the better, but rather among other things from the development of one's talents, fame and literary prowess. These are seen by Ta-hui as the fruits of clever arrangements of the calculating mind, not of the Mind of real wisdom and virtue. They are among the best of its fruits, but they cannot really avail anything; they cannot bring a man anything

---

1. _Letters_, p. 159.

2. _Letters_, p. 130.

meaningful with which to face death or any other crisis of the meaning of the self:

> Your fame fills the empire. What you in your lifetime have gotten by good management, what you have obtained by calculation, what you have achieved with apt quotations, are literary accomplishments, fame, and high office. In your later years you have harvested the fruits of these: are any of them real? You have written an infinite number of compositions in the literary language; is there a sentence in any of them that has really done you any good? How much difference is there between a man whose fame [spreads over the land] like a shadow, and a man who conceals his virtue and hides his light? How great is the difference between you at the time you were Han-lin 翰林 Scholar and when you were a student who had not yet taken the final civil service examination? Today you are already approaching seventy. If you apply all of your talent, what [more] can you expect to gain now? On the 30th day of the 12th month (the last day of the year, a day on which all accounts are settled; i.e., the day of your death) how will you give account? The killer-demons of impermanence won't stop for an instant.[1]

Some scholars, most notably Araki Kengo of Kyūshū University in Japan, have suggested that Ta-hui, in analyzing and criticising shih-tai-fu education and practice in this way, was pointing to causes of the failures of that group in the political sphere during his own lifetime.[2] In Ta-hui's letters and sermons there is no reference, direct or indirect, to the political situation. Yet even if we have no evidence that Ta-hui concerned himself with policy questions, a concern for the nation was very prevalent at the time and could have led him to observe the

---

1. Letters, p. 114. Letter to Wang Tsao.

2. Araki Kengo, Daie sho, pp. 254-55.

weakness of both the leaders who had lost the North and those who refused to fight to get it back. It seems possible, as Araki suggests, that he did see his own time as a period of demoralization among the educated elite, a period in which his mission was to revitalize the leadership of the country through Ch'an practice and enlightenment.[1]

It was, I think, this sense of mission that led him both to teach so many shih-tai-fu with so much care, and to analyze their problems as shih-tai-fu as well as students of Ch'an. As we have seen, as his criticism was sharp, so was his analysis radical: it pointed to the root of the problem at the level of consiousness and desire. His remedy, insight into their true Natures that would enable shih-tai-fu to realize true virtue, was correspondingly radical. For Ta-hui the disease of shih-tai-fu was at the most fundamental level, and must be fought at that level. Ch'an practice was precisely the instrument designed for the purpose.

To bring about a desire for knowledge of the ultimate Self, that is, for enlightenment, Ta-hui reminded shih-tai-fu of the approach of death. Death is the crisis in which judgment is final, the moment at which it will no longer be possible to "muddle through" with schemes bent on sustaining mundane values. If a shih-tai-fu does not know where he came from at birth, and where he is going at death, if he is a prisoner of his karma, then his ignorance and powerlessness are greatly to be pitied. His only hope is to strive for enlightenment.

---

1. Ibid.

Having seen the pursuit of enlightenment as the way toward wisdom and effectiveness for shih-tai-fu, Ta-hui not unnaturally devoted much thought to the problems encountered by shih-tai-fu in pursuing the study of Ch'an. Their chief problems were those that grew out of the shih-tai-fu's lifelong approach to learning discussed above. Scholar-officials saw Ch'an truth as external to themselves, as something they could grasp as an object. Often they thought they had "understood" the answer before they had even come to see on what level the question was meant to engage them. They made the fatal error of thinking there was a "truth" to be gained:

> Scholar-officials are often hindered by their quick intelligence from achieving a true view. It is because of this that Prajñā does not become manifest [in them]. Intelligent men's minds [naturally] run on ahead. When they see a teacher open his mouth, before the words are out they have already understood what he will say. They are as impeded by this as if Mount Sumeru were covering their original Natures. Because of this they don't know where they come from at birth and go to at death. Do you want to know? You must be enlightened.[1]

> You have wealth and noble position, but you are not bound and fettered by them. If you had not long ago planted the seeds of Prajñā, how could that have happened? But I fear that along the way you will forget your intention, and be hindered by your aptitude and intelligence. You will place the idea of there being something to be gained in front of you, and will not be able, at that crucial point where the ancients cut through directly, to cut into two with one stroke and be at peace.[2]

---

1. P'u Shuo, p. 437b.

2. Letters, p. 13.

> If you understand Ch'an this way, then you shouldn't study it at all. You "understand" even before the teacher has opened his mouth. That really is just figuring things out with your feelings and consciousness. Don't you know that I say that practice controlled by feelings and consciousness creates worldly entanglements [in your mind], such that you lose that which really belongs to you?[1]

Ta-hui goes so far as to recommend to shih-tai-fu that they give up intelligence and embrace stupidity when studying the Ch'an Way. Shih-tai-fu must understand that the kind of clarity they seek obscures the Way, whereas what they would regard as obscurity is the place where the truth makes itself known:

> Today's scholar-officials are often impatient to master Ch'an, and so they laborously think about sūtras and teachings, even about the words of the patriarchs and masters, wanting [to be able] to explain it all clearly. But you must know that to make it clear is exactly to make it not clear. If you can pierce through one "wu" [kung-an], you won't be concerned to ask others whether you understand clearly or not. It is for this reason that I instruct scholar-officials to become dull-witted. To take a first place on a dullness exam list is not such a bad thing! The only thing to be afraid of is turning in a blank piece of paper in the exam (that is, not trying at all). Ha! Ha![2]

Scholar-officials in these various ways are deluded by their attachment to their talent for grasping things that are external to them. What Ch'an wishes to facilitate is a quite different kind of understanding, one in which the Self itself is that which the self knows. For this kind of knowledge which transcends the subject-object dichotomy, the usual "talents" are irrelevant.

---

1. P'u Shuo, p. 476b.

2. Letters, p. 158.

Worst of all, however, is the scholar-official who treats Ch'an like a plaything, or like a skill that can be mastered and then shown off in jousts and tests of profundity: if I say anything that you can't answer, then I am more profound than you. Such a person trivializes Ch'an. Since his pride is involved in his so-called accomplishment, he will never teach himself the truth:

> There is another kind [of _shih-tai-fu_], one who who has all his life been very intelligent and able to expound the reasons for things, one who thinks there "there is none of the worldly arts that I haven't mastered, there is only this one matter of Ch'an that I haven't understood." Such a person when he is an official calls several fly-by-night teachers to come to him, and gives them a meal. When they have finished eating, he asks them to preach without restraint their groundless teaching. Then he commits this teaching to memory, and with the idea of helping people he gives them a sentence here, listens to a sentence there, and calls this "Ch'an jousting" (_wen-ta Ch'an_ 問答禪). "If in the end I have one more sentence left, and you have no more words to reply, then that means that I have won." This is so bad that if he were to knock up against a real clear-sighted fellow (an enlightened teacher), he wouldn't recognize him. Supposing that he did recognize him, he still wouldn't have decided faith, and wouldn't be willing with complete composure and serenity to give up everything. When he meets a teacher who in this world of things that go well for us (_shun_ 順) and things that don't (_ni_ 逆), uses hammer and tongs to show him his Original Allotment, he is frightened and doesn't dare approach him. This is what is known as a pitiable fellow.[1]

Shih-tai-fu are afraid to give up rational thought. When they do so in their meditation, what they experience is "vague obscurity." This

1. _Letters_, p. 110.

they don't like, so they retreat into ratiocination again, declaring that they are afraid of "falling into emptiness":

> Many scholar-officials who study the Way do not grasp the true understanding. When they eliminate verbal discussions and thoughts of the mind, they find vague obscurity with no place to put one's foot or hand. They don't believe that this place with no place for one's foot or hand is precisely the right place, they only think of wanting to obtain something by calculation in their minds, and being able to explain something clearly with their mouths. They don't know how wrong this is.[1]

> Nowadays scholar-officials often take thought and calculation as their dwelling, and when they hear this kind of preaching, they say, "isn't this falling into emptiness?" This is like jumping into the water before the boat has even set sail. It is deeply sad.[2]

When shih-tai-fu do move closer to the truth, or catch glimpses of it, dangers still await them that derive from their desires and expectations as shih-tai-fu:

> So often scholar-officials when things are not going well obtain a glimpse [of their Nature], but when things seem to be going well [and they are pleased], they lose it. I can't not tell you about this. When things are going well, you must at all times keep in mind the time when things are not going well; don't gradually forget. But when you have obtained the root, don't be sorry because you haven't gotten the branches. Only know how to be a Buddha, don't worry that you haven't a Buddha-like gift of explanation. This thing that you have obtained is easy to get but hard to keep; you absolutely must not be in a rush. First make your head and tail (your whole self) correct, extend and control it, then extend what you have left over to reach things.[3]

---

1. Letters, pp. 106-107.

2. Letters, p. 14.

3. Letters, p. 82.

To overcome these difficulties, shih-tai-fu must have "decided faith,"[1] one thing which, perhaps because of their rational training among other reasons, they find very difficult to attain.

Later in this chapter and the next we will look more closely at Ta-hui's ideas on Ch'an practice generally, including his advocacy of hua-t'ou practice and rejection of other kinds of practice. We will examine there also the theoretical understanding of the human personality and the process of enlightenment that underlay these judgments. We will argue at that time that Ta-hui's concern for the enlightenment of shih-tai-fu and his awareness of their special problems in reaching it influenced his advocacy of hua-t'ou or kōan practice. In hua-t'ou inspection he found the one form of practice that would harness the energy of doubt and drive through the barriers arising from clinging to rational understanding. Suffice it to say here only that Ta-hui observed that those mistaken attitudes toward learning, knowledge and wisdom that prevented shih-tai-fu in their careers from "bringing life to all things" prevented them also from seeking the right things from their Ch'an study, and from seeing that Ch'an understanding was not based on a subject-object dichotomy and a grasping of rational relationships. In condemning certain errors of contemporary shih-tai-fu, Ta-hui was not suggesting that they abandon the true goals and ideals of their role; on the contrary, the fact that he had nothing but praise for men who had truly benefitted the people in the districts where they served as officials suggests that he was sincerely hoping to enable shih-tai-fu

---

1. Letters, p. 73; Letters, pp. 110-11.

to embody true wisdom and virtue and realize their own ideal.

C. The Errors of Other Ch'an Teachers

Ta-hui was openly critical of the teachings and modes of Ch'an practice of certain other Ch'an teachers. Only one of these teachers he identified by name;[1] for the most part, however, he referred to them in general terms as "those stupid heretic teachers"[2] and identified them further only by their teachings. He stated that the teachings to which he objected had become very popular, and that he himself had studied under such teachers:

> I was once also taken in by these people. If I had not later met real Buddhist teachers, I would perhaps have wasted a lifetime. Every time I think about this, I can't bear it. Therefore I don't fear the bad karma [from speaking ill of others], but work with all my strength to save people from this evil.[3]

The teachings to which Ta-hui objected shared one fundamental defect: all advocated dangerous or erroneous understandings of Ch'an practice, denied the necessity of experiencing a moment of awkening (*wu*, *satori*), and avoided the use of *hua-t'ou* inspection as a means of practice. Further, all were particularly attractive to laymen, and all were especially unsuited to be helpful to laymen under the specific conditions of lay practice. Laymen were particularly vulnerable to the

---

1. The teacher Hsiang-yün T'an-i in Fukien (*Nien-p'u*, pp. 7b-8a; *P'u Shuo*, p. 436a). Cf. Ch. I, p. 28 above.

2. His favorite phrase is *tu-chüan hsieh chang-lao* 杜撰邪長老, or *tu-chüan han* 杜撰漢.

3. *Letters*, p. 50.

erroneous teachings to which Ta-hui objected, and they were likely to suffer most from their poisonous effects upon the mind.

Ta-hui identified four major errors being taught and practiced by his contemporaries: 1) "quiet sitting" or "silent illumination" practice; 2) being caught up in words so that one never sees the truth beyond them; 3) attention to consciousness and, 4) attachment to spontaneity. In his view, all four suffer from the same defect: they all fall into one half of a dichotomy and prevent the mind from reaching a moment of awakening into true enlightenment (satori). There is one medicine that will cure all four kinds of error: hua-t'ou practice.

Let us look more closely at Ta-hui's reasoning about these four categories of error, and the ways in which they particularly attracted laymen. The first category of error is that of errors associated with the mistaken practice of silence or stillness:

> Some call Ch'an being silent and sitting in the ghost cave under the black mountain with your brows knitted and your eyes closed, saying, 'this is what the ancient Buddha, or the time before I was born, was like.'[1]

> [Of all those who teach error], those who preach silent illumination, no words, emptiness, stillness, settling down in the ghost cave, seeking final peace and happiness, are the lowest of the low.[2]

Ta-hui saw the error of the practice of quieting the mind become very prevalent during his lifetime, and he spoke and wrote against it far more frequently than he did against any other major error. He used

1. Letters, p. 228.

2. Letters, p. 170.

various terms to refer to it. One of the most common was the term "silence and constant illumination" (*mo-erh-ch'ang chao* 默而常照), or its abbreviated form "silent illumination Ch'an" (*mo-chao Ch'an* 默照禪). These terms were associated with the writings of Ts'ao-tung school's most famous master of Ta-hui's time, Hung-chih.[1] For this reason Ta-hui is thought to have opposed, vocally and openly, the teachings of the Ts'ao-tung school in general and Hung-chih in particular.[2]

The origins of the long-standing coolness between the Soto and Rinzai schools of Zen in Japan can be traced in part both to the substance and the tone of Ta-hui's accusations against "silent illumination"

---

1. Hung-chih Cheng-chüeh 宏智正覺 (1091-1157) was a famous master of the Ts'ao-tung school in the ninth generation of the Yun-chü line. Ta-hui and Hung-chih were near contemporaries: Ta-hui was born in 1089, Hung-chih in 1091. But in 1125, the year that Ta-hui was enlightened, Hung-chih took a position as abbot of a temple, and thus was established on his own as a teacher somewhat earlier than Ta-hui. In 1129, when Hung-shih was thirty-eight, he went to live at the Ching-te Ssu on T'ien-t'ung-shan in Ming-chou in present Chekiang, where he remained until his death. Though he wrote a short treatise on "Silent Illumination," there is evidence in his recorded sayings that he also used *kung-an* in his teaching, and urged students to penetrate *kung-an* (cf. *Hung-chih Ch'an-shih kuang-lu*, *Taishō* 48, p. 67a). As mentioned above, Hung-chih was influential in arranging Ta-hui's appointment to Ah-yü-wang-shan, and before his death wrote to Ta-hui asking him to take charge of his affairs (cf. *Hsü-ch'uan-teng lu*, *chüan* 7, *Taishō* 51, p. 579c). Isshu Miura and Ruth Fuller Sasaki give a short biography of Hung-chih (*Zen Dust* [New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966], pp. 170-72). Cf. also Ishii Shūdō, "Daie Sōkō to sono deshi-tachi (roku)," pp. 336-39.

2. Ishii Shūdō suggests convincingly that Chen-hsieh Ch'ing-liao 真歇清了 was Ta-hui's central target ("Daie Sōkō to sono deshi-tachi [roku]," pp. 336-39). Chen-hsieh Ch'ing-liao became the sixteenth abbot of Hsüeh-feng-shan in Fukien in the eleventh month of 1130. He stayed there until 1136. Ta-hui's attacks began in 1134.

practice. But the question of who it was that Ta-hui was attacking remains somewhat of a mystery. Ta-hui went to visit Hung-chih late in the latter's life, and preached at his funeral.[1] He seems to have respected Hung-chih, as the respectful and playful tone of the very few passages that refer to Hung-chih by name indicate. For example, when Ta-hui after his return from exile was living very near Hung-chih, he says:

> If you believe there is satori, study with me. If not, go somewhere else to study. On the next mountain there is the monk T'ien-t'ung 天童 [Hung-chih], who is a teacher of the first rank. He was established as a monk when I was just a novice.[2] You go ask him. If he says satori is just the branches, I'll dare to say that he too is a blind fellow.[3]

And although Ta-hui attacked a term prominent in Hung-chih's writings, he never attacked Hung-chih or challenged him to a confrontation. In addition, he asserted repeatedly that all five Ch'an schools teach the same truth; it is simply not the case that any one school is right and the others wrong, or any one wrong and the others right.[4] Only those who do not realize the truth make the mistake of distinguishing among

---

1. Cf. Chapter I above.

2. Cf. p. 262, fn. 1.

3. P'u Shuo, p. 428a-b.

4. P'u Shuo, p. 418a; cf. also P'u Shuo, p. 435a. By the middle of the tenth century, the Ch'an tradition had evolved into five distinct teaching traditions, the Ts'ao-tung 曹洞, the Yün-men, the Fa-yen 法眼, the Kuei-yang 潙仰, and the Lin-chi. These were not mutually exclusive sects, and frequently monks studied under teachers from two or more of the five traditions, as Ta-hui himself had done. Cf. Isshū Miura and Ruth Fuller Sasaki, Zen Dust, pp. 148-49.

teachings of the five major schools.[1] Thus it seems clear that Ta-hui was not interested in a wholesale attack on the Ts'ao-tung school or its most prominent teacher, Hung-chih. Nonetheless, he did very strongly warn his students, and his lay students in particular, against what was apparently an important teaching of this school, "silent illumination" practice:

> Nowadays there is a monkish heresy [being taught]. The eyes [of the teachers] themselves aren't clear. They only teach people to fool around "resting." If you "rest" like this, [even if] you do it for the length of time it takes for a thousand Buddhas to come into the world, you won't really succeed in resting: instead you'll just cause your mind to be deluded. [These teachers say]: "Only rest and rest some more in this way, and emotions and thoughts won't be produced. At that moment, you won't experience vague dark insentience, but bright clarity." This kind of [talk] is a poison, it blinds men's eyes.[2]

Laymen, because of their desire to escape from the pressures of worldly cares, are particularly attracted to a teaching that urges withdrawal into stillness and freedom from worry:

> The mistaken teachers see that scholar-officials are usually busy (nao 鬧), so they prescribe quiet (ching 靜). The majority of men with experience of the world have long been bound to dust and toils. Suddenly someone tells them that they can practice stillness and silence; when they [through such practice] obtain a state of having no trouble in their breasts, they grasp onto this state and think that it is the highest final peace and joy....[3]

---

1. P'u Shuo, p. 418a; P'u Shuo, p. 435a.

2. Letters, p. 19.

3. Letters, p. 54.

> Those who realize that the realm of dust is confusion, that names and phenomena are not real, then kill their thoughts and quiet their minds. They cast aside their affairs and repair to emptiness. [They] close their eyes tightly, and when thoughts arise, they eliminate them one after the other. This kind of understanding is falling into the path of dead emptiness, of being a corpse whose spirit hasn't yet quite departed.[1]

Ta-hui advises that a practice that seeks stillness for the mind in quiet sitting is unnecessary and ineffective. It is unnecessary as a preparation for a more advanced type of practice, and does not prepare one for the moment of awakening. It is ineffective for many reasons. The most obvious is that the result of the deliberate practice of stillness is that one's mind becomes dry and withered; in one's stillness one becomes no different from an insensible tree or stone,[2] no different from a man in an unconscious state, a "corpse whose spirit has not yet left him." This kind of quietness is merely a temporary cutting off of mental activity, it merely "extinguishes one's mind's original marvelous bright nature" temporarily and to no good purpose:

> People who behave in this way can temporarily restrain their bodies; they regard this as a final state, but their mental consciousness still flies around like a wild horse. Even supposing their mental consciousness to be temporarily at rest, it is like grass pressed under a rock: when you are not looking it will grow again.[3]

In Ta-hui's opinion, the practice of quiet sitting or "silent illumination" is based on a misunderstanding of the teaching of the

---

1. Letters, p. 155.

2. Letters, p. 21; Letters, p. 87.

3. Letters, pp. 50-51.

Buddhas and the patriarchs about quietness. For example, Bodhidharma's teaching is often invoked as a model for the practice of "quiet sitting." To Ta-hui, this is the result of a misunderstanding of Bodhidharma's meaning:

> I received your letter. You say that [Bodhidharma's] 'Externally cut off all karmic causes, internally don't breathe in your mind, and when your mind is like a wall you can enter the Way'[1] is an upāya gate [into the Way]; the upāya gates of the earlier [teachers] can be used to enter the Way, but to grasp onto the upāya and not discard it [after it has served its purpose] is to cause harm. You are absolutely right. When I read [your words], I was overjoyed. Today these black-cask fellows all over the place are holding onto the upāya and not discarding it, they mistake it for a real Truth that can be taught to men, and as a result they blind the eyes of others more than a little.[2]

> Today when people hear this teaching [of Bodhidharma's] they interpret it as meaning that one should be rigidly unconscious, one should forcibly eliminate [all thoughts from one's mind] in order to make one's mind like a wall. This is what the ancients called completely misunderstanding an upāya.[3]

> If you want real quietness, then your samsaric mind must be broken through. Don't grasp onto practices; if your samsaric mind is broken through, then you will naturally attain quietness. When the former sages spoke of the upāya (means) of quietness, it was precisely this they were

---

1. Cf. Tao-yüan 道原, Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu 景德傳燈錄, chüan 3 (Taipei: Chen-shan-mei Ch'u-pan-she, 1967), p. 48, where a commentary tells us that Bodhidharma gave this instruction to Hui-k'o 慧可.

2. Letters, p. 27; cf. also P'u Shuo, p. 425a.

3. Letters, p. 225.

> speaking of. But these heretical teachers of later years don't understand the skillful speech of the former sages.[1]

There is real quietness, but it comes only after the samsaric mind has been destroyed in enlightenment:

> Everywhere people are saying, when you become still, then you will awaken to enlightenment. I say, when you are enlightened, then you will be still.[2]

For Ta-hui, the true teaching is that if you don't experience enlightenment, no matter how hard you try to sit in stillness, you'll never accomplish stillness.[3] The more you try to stop the motion of your mind in order to return to a state of mental stillness, the more distracted and confused your mind will become, and the effect sooner or later will be more motion.[4]

A stillness that is understood as the opposite of motion, a quietness of mind that is understood as the opposite of disturbance of mind, is merely an illusion of quietness, it is not the truly peaceful mind of the Buddha's teaching. A practice that seeks such quietness is actually a form of attachment to the present moment, the present state of mind. It is to enter the ghost cave, to busy oneself with the household budgets of ghost households: all you accomplish is to withdraw into experiencing the phenomena of the illusory world of withdrawn consciousness, separating your mind from its usual activities in the

---

1. Letters, p. 57.

2. P'u Shuo, p. 425a.

3. Ibid., p. 425a.

4. Cf. Letters, p. 87.

world of phenomena, and causing it to deal with figments of imagination. The "results" that one may enjoy from this kind of practice, the feeling of peace and freedom from worry, are not ultimate, they are not a glimpse into enlightened mind: rather they are just one more modification of samsaric mind. Until your samsaric mind is destroyed once and for all, it is a mistake to regard such transitory results as the goal of your practice.[1] You must realize that you are using your mind to create an illusion of "rest" in your mind. What you are tempted to identify as the ultimate experience of Emptiness is actually merely a creation of mental effort.

This becomes clear when one pauses to consider the way in which the whole concept of "quiet sitting" or "silent illumination" depends on a dichotomy which enlightenment causes one to transcend: namely, a false distinction between emptiness and stillness and excitement or motion. A truly quiet mind is undaunted by, is in fact active in, excitement or motion:

> Are you able to respond [with wisdom] in the times when you are busily doing things, throughout the 24 hours of the day? Have sleeping and waking become the same yet? If not, then you must not sink into emptiness or abide in stillness. The ancients called this 'to do the budgets of ghost households underneath the black mountain.'[2]

The mind's activity is everywhere, responding to every circumstance. The idea of "cutting off" mental activity in order to experience the

---

1. Letters, p. 54.

2. Letters, pp. 53-54.

emptiness of Mind is a view that grasps onto an emptiness that is separate from one's mind.[1] How can the marvelous activity of the Mind then appear to one in this state of blank, dead emptiness?

> [These foolish teachers] teach people to concentrate their minds, sit quietly and cut off their breathing...[But] the mind has no real essential nature--how can you control it and concentrate it? If you were to get hold of it, w..ere would you put it down?[2]

Mind, Ta-hui concludes, is "empty" of all self-nature, and transcends all discrimination and pairs of opposite characteristics, including stillness and disturbance:

> If you practice *wang-huai* 忘懷 (silent illumination) and *kuan-tai* 管帶 (grasping onto thought)[3] and you don't destroy your samsaric mind, you won't be able to avoid dividing Emptiness into two....You'll be infinitely happy in stillness, and suffer infinitely in movement. If you want to equalize the extremes of suffering and happiness, then you must not rouse your mind to *kuan-tai* or use your mind to *wang-huai*. Just be at ease twenty-four hours a day.[4]

---

1. *Letters*, p. 67.

2. *Letters*, p. 80.

3. "*Wang-huai* 忘懷," "to forget thoughts" or "to be without thoughts," Ta-hui elsewhere equates with what the "heretic teachers" call "*mo-chao*," or "silent illumination," and with the malady of allowing one's mind to sink into obscurity (*hun-ta* 昏怛). "*Kuan-tai* 管帶," "to direct, to collect and govern [the mind]," Ta-hui elsewhere equates with "*cho-i* 著意," to fix the attention [on something], "and with "*tiao-chu* 掉舉" to "raise" the mind (*P'u Shuo*, pp. 425a-b, 481a and 487a-b). Ishii Shudō discusses the pair of concepts "*wang huai*" and "*cho-i*" in the context of Ta-hui's ideas about *tso-ch'an* 坐禪 (Jap. *zazen*) ("Daie Sōkō to sono deshi-tachi [go]," *JIBS* XXII, No. 1 [Dec., 1973], pp. 291-95).

4. *Letters*, p. 92.

This dichotomizing understanding of stillness in which stillness is opposed to disturbance or motion and is sought in preference to disturbance is merely a form of a common mistake in Ch'an practice, the tendency to reject worldly phenomena to seek the Real:

> Stupid monks teach sitting quietly and waiting to become a Buddha. They say, in quietness there is no loss, in excitement there is loss. This is surely to reject worldly phenomena to seek the real phenomena![1]

The Buddha, says Ta-hui, used the <u>pāramitā</u> of quietness as an <u>upāya</u> to cure the sickness of distracted mind. If after one is rid of the disease one continues the medicine, one will fall into a state of grasping onto quietness as one of a pair of polar opposites.[2] Of one lay student who has been practicing quiet sitting for many years Ta-hui asks:

> When you open your eyes and respond to things, is your mind at rest? If not, that quiet practice hasn't been of any use. If it hasn't had any effect, you'd better seek an effective practice, or all of that past effort will have been wasted. The point of doing quiet practice is to control [one's mind at times of] excitement. If excitement disturbs your mind when you encounter it, then it is as though you had never done that quiet practice.[3]

Ta-hui insists that the problem of quiet sitting is not the practice itself, but the danger that quiet or stillness of mind be taken for ultimate Principle itself.[4] This mistake prevents people from finding

---

1. <u>Letters</u>, p. 92.

2. Cf. <u>Letters</u>, pp. 80-81; 92-93; 94-96.

3. <u>Letters</u>, p. 97.

4. <u>P'u Shuo</u>, p. 442a.

true enlightenment:

> When those who practice silent illumination come to the point of "saving strength" they think that this is the true point, and don't seek after miraculous enlightenment, taking stillness as the ultimate principle.[1]
>
> It is not that I don't teach sitting, it is just that I don't want you to think that sitting is the final Principle. If you do, then you won't let go of your body and life.[2]

The danger is exacerbated by the fact that teachers who urge "silent illumination" deny that there is such a thing as a moment of enlightenment,[3] or deny that it is fundamental to true Ch'an practice.[4] Some say that satori is madness;[5] some compare satori to a "second head" that one seeks, forgetting that one has a head already firmly attached.[6] Or they call satori an artificial construct (chien-li 建立),[7] an upāya established to motivate one to practice, but in no way essential to progress on the path to Buddhahood.[8] Or they say that "stillness is the root, satori the branches".[9] This metaphor of root and branches is

---

1. Letters, p. 64.

2. P'u Shuo, p. 425a.

3. P'u Shuo, p. 422a and many other places.

4. Letters, pp. 153-58.

5. Ibid.

6. P'u Shuo, p. 428a-b; Letters, pp. 153-58; p. 209-10.

7. P'u Shuo, pp. 425a, 428a, 418a, 426a, 453a, etc.

8. Letters, pp. 156-58.

9. P'u Shuo, p. 425a.

frequently used in Chinese philosophical writing to distinguish between the primary or fundamental and the secondary effects of manifestations.[1] People who waste time concerning themselves with the branches when they should be attacking the problem at its roots are those who do not truly understand the Way of things. Thus these heretical teachers say that _satori_ will come, if it comes, as a secondary manifestation of the strength of the heart of one's practice, namely one's true Nature revealing itself in quiet mind.

Of all the arguments against _satori_, this "roots and branches" argument is the one that galled Ta-hui the most, and drew from him the most rebuttals. It assumes, as we have seen above, that true stillness of mind can be experienced without _satori_, an assumption Ta-hui vehemently denied. In addition, Ta-hui claimed that the metaphor in fact cuts against the point those who employ it seek to make. To say that _satori_ is to stillness as branches and leaves are to roots and trunk is to argue that _satori_ is a _sine qua non_ of true practice:

> If you say that stillness is the root and _satori_ the branches and leaves, where is there a root and trunk that doesn't produce branches and leaves? [Furthermore, since where there are roots there must be branches], if you can't understand the branches, how are you going to understand the root?

The metaphor is not one that Ta-hui would want to endorse as correctly portraying the true relationship between stillness of mind and satori:

> When the ancients had a moment of awakening (_satori_), that was the end of it; how can one talk about branches and roots?[2]

---

1. _P'u Shuo_, pp. 427b-28a.

2. _P'u Shuo_, p. 427b.

Nevertheless if the metaphor must be used, Ta-hui felt he could show that it demonstrates both the validity of satori as a real part of practice and the ignorance of those who claim to understand stillness without understanding satori.

On a more doctrinal level, Ta-hui argues, the proponents of stillness as the fundamental principle in Ch'an practice make a mistake in their interpretation of two key terms in Buddhist theory, "pen-chüeh 本覺" and "shih-chüeh 始覺".[1] "Pen-chüeh" refers to the Buddhist belief that one's mind is from the beginning of time fully enlightened; "shih-chüeh" refers to the belief that at some point in time we pass from imprisonment in ignorance and delusion to a true vision of the transcendent activity of our mind. Our enlightenment is timeless, yet our realization of it occurs in time.

Ta-hui claimed that the followers of "silent illumination" collapse these two important poles of the enlightenment paradox into one. They take "silence and no words" as "shih-chüeh," and "the Nirvana of Bhīṣmagarjitasvararāja Terrible Sound King (i.e., a time incalculable aeons ago)" as "pen-chüeh."[2] Since in their teaching they identify "silence and no words" with "the Nirvāṇa of Bhīṣmagarjitasvararāja," while they seem to be sustaining the distinction between "pen-chüeh" and "shih-chüeh," they are in fact trivializing it or eliminating it. Ta-hui

---

1. On pen-chüeh and shih-chüeh, cf. Yanagida Seizan, "Kanwa Zen ni okeru shin to gi no mondai," pp. 141-63, esp. pp. 142-43; and Yoshito S. Hakeda, The Awakening of Faith (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), pp. 37-38.

2. P'u Shuo, p. 466b.

saw this as a terrible mistake: the doctrinal distinction is necessary because "shih-chüeh" is different from "pen-chüeh" (while at the same time not-different from it): a moment of awakening does occur. If there were only "pen-chüeh," there wouldn't be any delusion. If all is adequately described as "awakening from the beginning" (pen-chüeh), then from what did Śākyamuni awake?

For Ta-hui, the only possible way to think about this and preserve the paradox is that it is because of "awakening for the first time" (shih-chüeh) at a given instant that one comes to accord with his Mind which is "awakened from the beginning" (ho-pen-chüeh 合本覺).[1]

A second major category of error is the kind of teaching that never manages to move a student beyond the level of rational understanding of words:

> You mustn't randomly and confusedly bore into the words of the teachings of the ancients. For example, when the great teacher Ma-tsu 馬祖 met the monk Huai-jang 懷讓, [Huai-jang] 懷讓 said to him: 'Take an ox-cart; if the cart doesn't move, do you hit the cart or do you hit the ox?' When the teacher Ma-tsu heard this, he immediately knew to return [to the Nature]. All over the country many are preaching about these words, as

---

1. In Chapter 20 of the Lotus Sūtra the Buddhahood and Nirvāṇa of Bhīṣmagarjitasvararāja is described; we are told:

> "Long ago, beyond incalculable, unlimited asamkhyeyakalpas, not subject to reckoning or discussion, there was a Buddha named King of Imposing Sound (Bhīṣmagarjitasvararāja)... whose kalpa was named Free of Deterioration (Vinirbhāga), whose realm was named Great Coming into Being (Mahāsambhavā)" (Taishō 9, p. 50b; Leon Hurvitz, trans., Scripture of the Lotus Blossom of the Fine Dharma [New York: Columbia University Press, 1976], p. 279; italics added).

Thus this Buddha and his Nirvāṇa can symbolize the original Buddha and Nirvāṇa at the time of the evolution of this world.

> many as the thunder and lightening, clouds and rain; and yet they can't understand them, but mistakenly offer names and words, and give rise to understanding according to the words.[1]

Thinking is not dangerous to the enlightened, who know where thought arises in the Mind.[2] But if a student hasn't reached this stage, he must not let himself be led into the ghost cave by the groundless and pointless talk of heretical teachers to knit brows and bring eyes together to perform deluded thought.[3]

Allowing oneself to try to understand words rationally leads to a myriad of wasteful and harmful kinds of "practice." For example, some teachers allow students to believe that the practice of Ch'an consists in thinking about and discussing the kung-an (kōans) of earlier teachers.[4] Such students try to determine what answers to kōans are correct. Alternatively they categorize the answers that other teachers have given to kōans or the replies they have given to questions.

> What some mean by Ch'an is making comments on and categorizing the sayings of the earlier teachers: this one is "empty," that one is "real," this one is "mysterious," that one is "wonderful," this is a substitute word, that one is an "alternate" word, and so forth.[5]
>
> Don't study a little today, and a little tomorrow, asking "how can we understand this kung-an?

---

1. P'u Shuo, pp. 465b-66b.

2. Letters, p. 45.

3. Letters, pp. 48-49.

4. P'u Shuo, p. 429b.

5. Letters, p. 288.

> What reply can we give to that kung-an?" "This saying relates to the realm of distinctions, that saying relates to the essence of the truth." Don't you know that Yün-men said, "Understand the old man in your own room"? All this is running around seeking in the realm of externals, it isn't going to the real place and making effort. So many Ch'an monks today expend their mental energy on this. They go to the books of the ancients and "understand" rationally ~ few kung-an, and call this making effort. Far from it![1]

This kind of practice leads to a kind of vanity, a false pride in pseudo-accomplishment; sometimes students go so far as to demand certification as masters of Ch'an on the basis of such external understanding. Unfortunately, Ta-hui notes, there are teachers willing to certify such an understanding.[2]

Yet another mistake is to allow oneself to be misled into thinking that the differences in form among the five Ch'an schools mean that the content of their thinking is truly different. Ta-hui insists that there are no differences among the five schools as to the truth they teach; only the unenlightened are misled by apparent differences and do not see that the five schools are members of one family.[3] The fact that the forms and verbal expressions differ, however, leads some monks and lay students to rush around trying to "master" the teachings of all five, something that would only seem necessary to those who had not yet seen beyond the level of rational understanding. Ta-hui himself studied

---

1. P'u Shuo, pp. 410b-11a.

2. Letters, p. 110.

3. P'u Shuo, pp. 418a and 435a.

under masters of all five schools before he was enlightened.[1] This, he feels, gives him the authority to assert that such "mastery" is effort wasted. Ta-hui advises:

> Don't be concerned with how many kung-an you've understood, how many teachings of how many different schools of Ch'an you've mastered; none of this will do any good on the last day.[2]

A related practice that doesn't go beyond words is the practice of Ch'an jousting. Students test their understanding by challenging other students to contests of wits: whoever manages to say something Ch'an-like that can baffle the other wins. In the hands of truly enlightened teachers such Ch'an jousting has some value, Ta-hui concedes;[3] but for most students, Ch'an jousting deteriorates into a kind of play, and makes Ch'an practice into one more intellectual pastime, distracting students from the real search for enlightenment.[4]

Two other variations indulged in by teachers are what Ta-hui calls "hsia-yü Ch'an 下語禪,"[5] the making of penetrating comments on sayings of others; and what Ta-hui calls "t'an-hsuan shuo-miao 談玄說妙,"[6] talking about the realm of the mysterious. Here is Ta-hui's description of the latter type:

---

1. P'u Shuo, p. 425a.

2. Ibid., pp. 430a-b.

3. Ibid., pp. 439a-b.

4. Ibid., pp. 439a-b; also Letters, pp. 110-11.

5. P'u Shuo, pp. 156-57; cf. P'u Shuo, p. 32.

6. Ibid., p. 445b.

> The inferior ones [among the heretics] play with karmically determined consciousness and believe it to be the door to the [Ch'an] Dharma-gate: they blow through their lips and talk about mystery and wonder. The ones who are really bad go mad and show no restraint in the quantities of words they use; [they pour out] barbarian (Sanskrit) words and Chinese words, pointing to the east and painting descriptions of the west.[1]

> Such teachers are very dangerous: only be afraid of those who preach very convincingly, and describe [the highest state] very convincingly, but haven't seen it, haven't awakened. Old Śākyamuni described them as men of the highest arrogance, as slanderers of Prajñā, as great liars, as those who cut off the Buddha's wisdom-life.[2]

Yet another form of teaching that doesn't move students on to enlightenment is theoretical teaching, which Ta-hui calls "Mind and Nature Ch'an" (hsin-hsing Ch'an 心性禪).[3] Students who grasp the essentials of the theory underlying Ch'an practice may reach a firm intellectual understanding, but they will not find themselves closer to enlightenment.

Another mistake of theoretical teachers is teaching a stage theory of practice: one, for example, teaches students first to understand "this mind is Buddha"; then to understand "no mind, no Buddha"; and finally to understand "it is neither mind, nor Buddha, nor a thing."[4] Ta-hui finds this utterly laughable, and warns against trying to build

---

1. Letters, p. 170.

2. Ibid., p. 144.

3. P'u Shuo, pp. 429a and 429b.

4. P'u Shuo, p. 414b.

up enlightenment layer by layer like a pagoda![1]

In contrast to the extensive treatment Ta-hui gave to the first two major categories of errors, he seems to have said relatively little on the third. The third category of error in practice is that of meditation through attention to the contents of consciousness: this seems to be the meaning of the practice Ta-hui refers to as kuan-tai:

> Teachers of kuan-tai give rise to understanding by preserving the mirror of perceptions in front of the eyes.[2]

A related teaching is the instruction to "follow karmic causes" (sui-yüan 隨緣):

> They also teach people to follow their karmic causes (sui-yüan) and receive and attend to [what comes into consciousness] (kuan-tai), to forget feelings and illume silently. They 'illumine' and 'illumine,' 'accept' and 'accept,' but it all just adds delusion covering over their Minds; this delusion won't come to an end. [Such teachers] abandon the upāya of the patriarchs and teachers, and wrongly direct their students, teaching them to waste this life and die in vain.[3]

The meaning of sui-yüan is an acceptance of the conditions and events of one's life; only one who is enlightened, whose samsaric mind is at an end, can truly accomplish it. Ta-hui condemns trying to accomplish sui-yüan as a means of practice prior to enlightenment as a waste of time, one more way of playing around with one's mental consciousness in a useless way.

---

1. Letters, pp. 22-23.

2. Ibid., p. 21. On kuan-tai, see footnote 3 on p. 269.

3. Letters, p. 19.

Another phrase whose meaning seems similar to that of the definition Ta-hui gives for *kuan-tai* is *chu-chang ku-shih* 主張顧視, to suggest [to students] observation [as a practice].[1] This too Ta-hui condemns as a practice that leads away from *satori* and is founded on a lack of faith in *satori* as a gate into the Way.

The fourth major error is to try to preserve spontaneity before one is enlightened:

> There are teachers who teach men only to make the mind free and untouched by things and entrust one's self to freedom, and not paying attention to giving birth to mind or the arising of thoughts. They say that when thoughts arise or vanish, they originally have no real substance; it is when you grasp onto them as real that the mind of *samsāra* arises. These fellows have given rise to understanding by creating an "ultimate truth" and preserving the form of spontaneity.[2]

Non-attachment and spontaneity are among the characteristics of the enlightened mind, but to instruct people to be spontaneous and ignore thoughts is to try to assume the characteristics of an enlightened person before one becomes one. It is not the way to become truly free.

Ta-hui expresses the same idea in a different way when he warns a student not to rest in the idea that there is "nothing that needs to be done" (*wu-shih* 無事).[3] We must realize that "there is nothing that needs to be done," but we may not, if we seek enlightenment, entrust ourselves to "spontaneity" and do nothing.

---

1. *P'u Shuo*, p. 429b.

2. *Letters*, p. 21.

3. *Letters*, pp. 50-51.

Of the four kinds of error, educated laymen were particulary susceptible to the first and second kinds, the two which Ta-hui most seeks to combat. He sees scholar-officials as especially prone to the second category of error, namely teaching and practice that do not move beyond the level of words and theories.

Some teachers try to counter the tendency in educated laymen to stay with words and theories by advising them to practice the first category of erroneous practice, silent illumination. This form of practice is attractive to lay students because it permits them to leave behind the worries of daily life by focusing their minds on something else. This may produce a feeling of well-being, but it is not an ultimate solution, for it either focuses the mind on yet another product of mental consciousness, whether "rest" or mind control or the contents of the mind at a given time, or allows the mind to sink into a temporary kind of unconsciousness not materially different from the unconsciousness of stones and trees. In either case the mind is occupied with further coverings of delusion of its own making and is not induced to break through delusion into enlightenment.

In general, Ta-hui argues, whenever one uses mind to create some state or occupy itself with its own product, one result is merely further entanglement with mental consciousness. Another result is inevitable dichtomizing, for this is the natural function of mental consciousness. If mental consciousness is instructed to seek out quiet and rèject disturbance, the result will be a constant mental over-compensation--the mind, once it realizes that it has seized onto one extreme, will drop that extreme and seize the other. A third result is

that what is sought by the mind will be the object of a subject-object dichotomy; as the mental subject seeks the "ideal" object, it will leap right over the "ground of the mind" which can never be the object of mental consciousness but which is the true "object" of the search for enlightenment.

For this reason, encouraging any kind of mental effort or "mental support" for one's practice is a false teaching, not the Buddha's teaching. Such teaching mistakes the disease for the medicine. What one needs to do is not to use the mind to stop its own activity, but to cease trying to put the mind through such hoops at all. To bring to an end such mental gymnastics in the name of practice, to put a stop to such unceasing concentration on mental steps or mental products, Ta-hui recommends the remedy of hua-t'ou or kung-an practice.

Chapter VIII: Faith, Doubt and the Hua-t'ou

Ta-hui taught his monastic and lay disciples that two apparently contradictory mental attitudes were essential for successful practice of the path to enlightenment. One was definite, absolute faith, and the other was doubt. On the subject of the need for faith, Ta-hui followed in the tradition of his Mahāyāna predecessors, showing a particular indebtedness to the Hua-yen sūtra and to his great Ch'an predecessor and the founder of his line, Lin-chi. On the subject of doubt, Ta-hui developed a line of thought that may have begun with Wu-tsu Fa-yen (Gozu) 五祖法演, the teacher of his own teacher Yüan-wu. We are told that Wu-tsu tried to get his students to carry "a great ball of doubt."[1] For the popularity of the idea of the crucial importance of concentrating all one's doubts upon one great doubt, the tradition is far more indebted to Ta-hui than to Wu-tsu or any of Wu-tsu's Dharma-heirs. For the more theoretically formulated understanding that doubt itself can be used as an instrument to destroy both discrete doubts and the doubting samsaric mind itself, the Ch'an tradition is clearly greatly indebted to Ta-hui in the first instance. It was Ta-hui who first explained and emphasized the importance of hurling the energy of all one's doubts upon the one great doubt to which the hua-t'ou gives rise. Ta-hui's clear and repeated exposition of this idea to laymen and monks alike was one of his major contributions to the teaching and practice of Lin-chi Ch'an and Rinzai Zen.

---

1. Ogisu, "Shoki," p. 115.

A brief look at the teachings of the Hua-yen sūtra on the subject of faith, and of Lin-chi on the subjects of faith and doubt, will help us to see Ta-hui's teachings on these subjects in their true context.

A. The Hua-yen sūtra and Faith

The Japanese scholar Yamada Ryōken has done a very suggestive short study of the meaning of faith (hsin 信 or ching-hsin 淨信) in the Hua-yen sūtra.[1] He points to a creative ambiguity in the way the term is used in the sūtra. On the one hand, faith is required as the entrance into the Bodhisattva path as taught in the sūtra. This is symbolically expressed in the fact that the second assembly of the sūtra, an assembly at which Mañjuśrī appears and preaches about faith, takes place on earth, while for the following third assembly, the scene is shifted to one of the heavenly realms (t'ien-chieh 天界). Symbolically this suggests that faith belongs to the realm of ordinary persons (fan-fu, Jap. bompu 凡夫), persons who have not yet given rise to the bodhicitta, the mind of seeking enlightenment. In the traditional formulation, it is when the ten kinds of faith are complete that one enters the stages of the Bodhisattva path itself.

But Yamada points out that this is not the only view of faith expressed in the sūtra. In the second assembly Mañjuśrī teaches that faith and wisdom are complementary. Faith is purified by wisdom, while wisdom is deepened by faith. Yamada suggests that it is misleading to

1. Yamada Ryōken, "Kegon kyōgaku ni okeru shin no ichi", in Bukkyō ni okeru shin no mondai, pp. 259-73.

understand the sūtra as teaching that faith is only a preliminary step that must be taken in order to enter the Bodhisattva path. In fact faith (ching hsin 淨信) is grounded in the Dharmadhātu itself; faith is taught in the sūtra as the subjective aspect of the one whole of which the Dharmadhātu is the objective aspect. Faith is not only the first (shou 首) of the 10,000 practices on the path; faith is the subjective foundation (pen 本) of every stage of the Bodhisattva path, and thus in one sense corresponds to no one stage on the path more than to the others. Yamada points out that Mañjuśrī teaches that the merit of one thought-moment of faith is limitless; the merit of one thought-moment of faith will certainly bring one to enlightenment or Buddhahood. Thus within the merit of faith the whole of the Bodhisattva path is included. Yamada suggests that it is merely an extention of this teaching already found in the Hua-yen sūtra to conclude, as the Hua-yen patriarch Fa-tsang came very close to saying and as later Buddhists have said, that "when one's faith is perfect one attains Buddhahood (hsin-man ch'eng-fo 信滿成佛)." Although faith as taught by Mañjuśrī at the second assembly has its proper objects--the Buddha, the Buddha's teaching, the virtues of the Dharmakāya--and its proper practice--chiefly the giving rise to a great vow (yüan 願) that causes one's life to become the path, perfect faith is very closely related to that enlightenment in which the whole of the Dharmadhātu is realized at once, and subject and object, practice and goal are transcended. Thus, following Yamada Ryōken's view, it might be possible to say that in the Hua-yen sūtra faith pertains in the first instance to the "ordinary person" and

enables him, even in the realm of discriminations, to set out on the path. But faith is also the foundation of the path in all of its stages; and, in its nature as an aspect of the Dharmadhātu, faith transcends in principle distinctions between subject and object, path and goal.

B. The Lin-chi lu and Faith

In the Recorded Sayings of Lin-chi[1] (Lin-chi lu 臨濟錄) the term "hsin" is used in a way that also suggests a very close link between the transcendent Mind itself and that "faith" which nominally has the transcendent Mind for its object. Following a clue offered by Yanagida Seizan in an influential article on the meaning of "faith" for Lin-chi,[2] let us look at Lin-chi's usage of the term in some detail.

Lin-chi I-hsüan's 臨濟義玄 date of birth is impossible to determine exactly, but he died in 866. The text that we associate with his name, the Lin-chi lu, went through many recensions; the version on which this study is based probably originated in the Northern Sung period; it can definitely be traced as far back as 1120, and probably as far back as 1085. Other sources for his teaching exist, but for our purposes we shall limit our examination to the Lin-chi lu, which, whether

---

1. For text information, see Yanagida Seizan, Zenke goroku II, p. 472; idem, Rinzai roku (Tokyo: Daizō Shuppansha, 1972), and Yanagida's introduction to his Japanese translation in Zenke goroku I, p. 307.

2. Yanagida Seizan, "Kanwa Zen ni okeru shin to gi no mondai," in Bukkyō ni okeru shin no mondai, pp. 141-63.

or not it was the earliest, was by far the most influential and widely circulated record of Lin-chi's teachings.[1]

In an article in Japanese on the meaning of faith in Mahāyāna Buddhism, Abe Masao suggests a framework which may shed light on Lin-chi's use of the term "to have faith."[2] He suggests that although there are many variations on the teaching about faith within the Mahāyāna literature and schools, there are two basic meanings. One is faith with an object, faith seen as over against the Dharma or the absolute. This is the meaning usually associated with the view that faith is the necessary first step toward entering the Buddha-Dharma. The other is faith as the Dharma itself manifest in subjectivity, the awareness of the Pure Mind itself. Abe argues that outside of the realization that there is no "I" to form the subject that "believes in" Dharma, there is no true faith. He argues that when we "believe in the Dharma", it is not a question of our self-centered self believing something, but of the Dharma showing itself in our subjectivity where that selfish self is denied. The Dharma, he says, doesn't show itself anywhere but in our faith. Giving rise to the bodhicitta and entering the Bodhisattva path is thus the accomplishment of the Dharma in our subjectivity. When one

---

1. Zenke goroku I, p. 307.

2. Abe Masao, "Gendai ni okeru shin no mondai: Bukkyō-teki shin to risei," in Bukkyō ni okeru shin no mondai, pp. 21-45.

reads the Lin-chi lu carefully, one finds many usages which suggest that Lin-chi understood "faith" primarily in this second sense.[1]

We find in Lin-chi's Recorded Sayings, among 14 passages in which the word "faith" is used, one passage in which the conventional meaning of faith as a precondition for success on the path to enlightenment appears:

> For those whose root of faith is insufficient a final day (enlightenment) will never come.[2]

But in the remaining passages the meaning of "faith" is transformed by an apparent change in its relation to the object.

"Hsin" used as a verb, "to have faith", is normally transitive in Chinese. Only in two passages in the Lin-chi lu does Lin-chi give this verb an explicit object. In one he says:

> Just desist from thinking, and never seek outside. If something should come, illuminate it. Just have faith in your activity revealed now--there isn't a thing to do [to achieve enlightenment].[3]

Another example is similar in linguistic structure and in point:

> Unwilling to have faith in the possession within your own house, you do nothing but seek outside.[4]

These are the only cases in the Lin-chi lu where the verb hsin, to believe, to trust, to have faith in, is given an object stated in the

---

1. I have used the text published in Zenke goroku I, p. 308-86 (hereafter ZGI), and the recently published translation, The Recorded Sayings of Ch'an Master Lin-chi Hui-chao of Chen Prefecture, by Ruth Fuller Sasaki, Yoshitaka Iriya, Dana Fraser, Kazuhiro Furuta and others (Kyoto: The Institute for Zen Studies, 1975), hereafter called "Sasaki."

2. ZGI, p. 310; Sasaki, p. 2. I have added "(enlightenment)."

3. ZGI, p. 330; Sasaki, p. 17. I have added "[to achieve enlightenment]."

4. ZGI, p. 353; Sasaki, p. 36.

sentence. But what is the object? It is one's own true Mind, or its activity, both things that can never be the object of samsaric mind in a model of knowing in which subject and object are dichotomized.

There are other examples in Lin-chi of hsin used as a verb in which an object seems to be implied. For example, let us look at cases in which hsin is used with the simple negative, pu, forming pu-hsin:

> Virtuous monks, with your bowl-bag and your dung-sack slung from your shoulders, you rush up blind alleys, seeking Buddha and seeking Dharma [outside Mind]. Do you know who it is who right now is running around searching this way? He is brisk and lively, with no roots at all. Though you [try to] embrace him, you cannot gather him in; though you [try to] drive him away, you cannot shake him off. If you seek him he retreats farther and farther away; if you don't seek him, then he's right there before your eyes, his wondrous voice resounding in your ears. If a man has no faith [in this], he'll waste his entire life.[1]

> I say to you there is no Buddha, no Dharma, nothing to practice, nothing to prove. Just what are you seeking thus in the highways and byways? Blind men! You're putting a head on top of the one you already have. What do you yourself lack! Followers of the Way, your own present activities do not differ from those of the patriarch-buddhas. You just don't believe [this] and keep on seeking outside.[2]

Here again the object of faith is something that only the enlightened Mind can recognize, for it is the enlightened Mind itself in its activity. Other examples can be drawn from the five passages in which we find the

---

1. ZGI, p. 345; Sasaki, p. 29.

2. ZGI, p. 340; Sasaki, p. 25. I have put brackets around "this" in Sasaki's translation, because it is not in the Chinese text.

resultative verbal form, hsin-pu-chi 信不及, believing with the result of not reaching, or simply stated, having insufficient faith:[1]

> Venerable Śākyamuni said: "Dharma is separate from words, because it is neither subject to causation nor dependent upon conditions." Your faith [in this] is insufficient, therefore we have bandied words today.[2]

> What is Dharma? Dharma is mind-dharma. Mind-dharma is without form; it pervades the ten directions and is manifesting its activity right before your very eyes. Since men lack sufficient faith [in this], they accept names and phrases, and try to speculate about Buddha-dharma from written words.[3]

> Followers of the Way, right now in the beginning there is nothing to do. Only because your faith [in this] is insufficient do you ceaselessly chase about.[4]

> Because your faith [in yourselves] is insufficient, you students turn to words and phrases and from them create your understanding.[5]

In all of these cases that in which students must have faith is something that cannot be the object of mere belief. How could the dichotomizing samsaric mind of what Abe calls the selfish self believe

---

1. Tokiwa Gishin argues that in the Lin-chi lu the term hsin-pu-chi means "lacking in confidence in one's Original Self" (p. 513) and that the term is so used twice in the Lankāvatāra sūtra, chapter 2, the Sanskrit being abhutva śraddha. He translates its opposite as "Self-confidence" (p. 511). He states: "What is truly confident of Ones' True Self is none other than the Self" (p. 510). ("The 信不及 (Shin Fugyū) as expounded in the Lankāvatāra," JIBS XXIV, no. 1 [Dec. 1975], pp. 508-13). Thus his argument parallels my own.

2. ZGI, p. 310; Sasaki, p. 2.

3. ZGI, p. 323; Sasaki, p. 11.

4. ZGI, p. 326; Sasaki, p. 13.

5. ZGI, p. 344; Sasaki, p. 78.

in the sense Lin-chi means that Dharma is separate from words, or that you are the Buddha, or that Mind-Dharma is without form yet manifests its activity right before our eyes, or that we are already enlightened, there is nothing more to do? Samsaric mind cannot understand these things, for they violate its very principle of understanding; a belief without understanding, a belief that did not destroy the samsaric mind, would be useless to prevent one's samsaric mind from continuing to hold that Dharma was in words, that the Buddha is different from oneself, that there is something (an enlightenment) to seek, that it can be sought outside oneself. How could truly have faith in these things unless one were enlightened?

Finally we come to the passages most difficult to interpret, the passages on which an argument for the radical subjectivity, radical objectlessness of Lin-chi's concept of faith has been made by Yanagida Seizan and other modern interpreters.[1] These are the passages in which we find variants on the term, "tzu-hsin 自信." "Faith in oneself," "one's own faith," "oneself believing," all seem possible translations of this combination of words. Let us look at the passages in which the term occurs:

> Students today can't get anywhere: what ails you? Not having self-faith is what ails you. Bring to rest the thoughts of the ceaselessly seeking mind, and you'll not differ from the Patriarch-Buddha. He is none other than you who stand before me listening to my discourses. Since you students

---

1. Cf. Yanagida, "Kanwa Zen."

> lack faith, you run around seeking something outside. If you lack self-faith, you'll keep stumbling along, bewilderedly following after all kinds of circumstances, be taken by those circumstances through transformation after transformation, and never be yourself.[1]
>
> Men who today study the Way must have self-faith. Don't seek outside.[2]

I have chosen to translate tzu-hsin as self-faith in the above passages in order to preserve some room for interpretation in the reader's mind. The translation "faith in oneself", seems to me the most simple and appropriate. Yet it can certainly be seen that the term here must have a deeper significance than we ordinarily give to it. Faith in oneself must mean the steady apprehension of the Buddha's Mind in our mind, of the Buddha's Activity in our activity, and the freedom from the temptation to seek elsewhere for our security or our truth. This kind of "faith in oneself" is not merely samsaric mind's confidence in itself, rather it is a considerable triumph over samsaric mind, a freedom from dichotomizing. Such freedom is usually associated with enlightened Mind itself. As we shall see below, for Lin-chi, doubt is eliminated by non-thinking; faith in formless truth and faith in oneself are also forms of non-thinking, forms of respite from or triumph over dichotomizing samsaric mind.

---

1. ZGI, p. 318; Sasaki, p. 7. The translation in Sasaki reads: "Lack of faith in yourself is what ails you." I have substituted a different translation.

2. ZGI, p. 330; Sasaki, p. 16. The translation in Sasaki reads: "must have faith in themselves."

Lin-chi has used the concept of "faith" to point in both directions. In one direction "faith" points to "trust or belief in an object in default of certainty," a possibility of the samsaric mind. Yet by always giving faith objects that are formless, and commonly implying rather than stating them, Lin-chi suggests that there is more to faith than a skillful instrument of samsaric mind, that faith is a triumph over samsaric mind, over subject-object dichotomy, and is closely related to subjectivity of enlightened Mind. This in turn accords very well with his emphasis on "enlightenment from the beginning" (pen chüeh 本覺): samsaric mind is not different from enlightened Mind. Faith, then, becomes a concept that bridges the gap between the two.

C. Ta-hui's Understanding of Faith

Ta-hui's use of the word hsin, "faith," shows the influence of both the tradition of Lin-chi in which he taught and the Hua-yen sūtra, his favorite scriptural text. As does the Hua-yen sūtra, Ta-hui puts emphasis both on the importance of faith as an essential first step, and on a vow as the expression of one's definite absolute faith. He says:

> You must enter through the gate of faith.[1]
>
> If you definitely want to break through completely in this life, don't doubt the Buddha, don't doubt the patriarchs, don't doubt life, don't doubt death, you must have decided faith and determination,

1. P'u Shuo, p. 440b.

> being with each thought like one trying to put out a fire on his head.[1]

and again:

> Right faith and right determination are the foundation of Buddhahood.[2]

Ta-hui repeats over and over again that faith in this Dharma is very different.[3] One must have a firm and definite, absolute faith.[4] A fatal pitfall is to believe and doubt by halves.[5] In that condition one will never make any progress. Ta-hui tells one laymen that when Mañjuśrī came to teach Sudhana, he patted Sudhana on the head and told him that if he were to lose faith, and thereby let his mind become tired and sink into a sea of worries, he would never make it to the goal; instead he would settle for some inferior goodness or merit, and never reach the real study and practice.[6]

In other passages, however, Ta-hui echoes the more profound meanings of "faith" as taught in the Hua-yen sūtra and the Lin-chi lu. For example, his favorite scriptural passage on faith is from the sixth chapter of the Hua-yen sūtra. It expresses both the fundamental necessity

---

1. Letters, pp. 73-74.

2. Letters, p. 79.

3. P'u Shuo, p. 424b; P'u Shuo, p. 436a-b; P'u Shuo, p. 459a.

4. P'u Shuo, p. 441a; Letters, p. 25.

5. P'u Shuo, pp. 418b-19a; Letters, p. 77.

6. Letters, p. 8. Ta-hui here freely interprets the account of this incident in Taishō 10, p. 333c.

of faith for practice on the path and the tremendous power of the merit of faith to enable one to reach the goal:

> Faith is the source of the Way, and the mother of merits. It nourishes and brings to maturity all good dharmas and cuts through the net of doubts; it can cause one to leave the stream of desires and show one the matchless path to Nirvāṇa. Faith can increase the merits of wisdom: faith must reach the land of Tathāgata.[1]

Here faith is very powerful--it has almost the power of enlightenment itself. Faith cuts through the net of doubts, just as enlightened mind, transcendent wisdom, does.

Two other examples which convey the same sense of the immense power of faith to contain path and goal also refer to the Hua-yen sūtra:

> One instant of sufficient faith is not different from the merits of Vairocana's first determining to become a Bodhisattva.[2]

> All Bodhisattvas follow the teaching of the worthy friends [kalyāṇamitras]. When they have no doubts and fears, they are at peace and their minds are not moved.[3]

In other passages we find Ta-hui using Lin-chi's phrases tzu-hsin (self-faith) and hsin-te-chi 信得及 (to believe sufficiently), or its negative, hsin-pu-chi 信不及 (to believe insufficiently). Here too, as in the Lin-chi lu, we find sufficient faith very closely related to the enlightened Mind in its power to go beyond subject and object.

---

1. Letters, p. 73. Cf. Taishō 10, p. 72b.

2. P'u Shuo, p. 459a.

3. P'u Shuo, p. 459a.

We are reminded of Lin-chi's use of the term faith to point in both directions, toward the samsaric mind's trust in what is not yet certain, and toward the enlightened Mind's freedom from doubt of the Truth For example, he says:

> If you have sufficient faith, all the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas will appear on the tip of a hair.[1]
>
> If you have sufficient faith, see, and awaken, then it doesn't matter if you can't talk about it expertly.[2]
>
> If you have sufficient faith, then Yung-chia's words... aren't empty words; all is Ch'an.[3]

The fact that, as compared with Lin-chi, Ta-hui places far more emphasis on "faith" as a necessary first step on the path to enlightenment, surely reflects Ta-hui's interest in lay Buddhist piety. In lay piety faith would be a clearly understood and expected category; in lay practice faith and other first instrumental steps toward enlightenment would figure more prominently than they would in the practice of monks, for monks would have achieved these first steps already in some measure. In his attempt to move laymen on to the difficult daily pursuit of hua-t'ou practice, Ta-hui found it necessary to emphasize the importance of faith in the sense of "trust in that which is not certainly known." Faith in this sense was apparently of no interest to Lin-chi, perhaps because he was addressing a different audience for whom preaching this instrumental trust would not be a skillful means.

---

1. P'u Shuo, p. 458a.

2. P'u Shuo, p. 466b.

3. Letters, p. 103.

D. Lin-chi and Ta-hui on Doubt

Let us turn to the meaning which Lin-chi and Ta-hui give to "doubt." Here the contrast between Ta-hui's usage and that of Lin-chi is striking and significant.

In the Lin-chi lu the word "doubts" (or "doubt": in Chinese, number is rarely indicated for nouns) is given the traditional meaning of mental obstacles to faith, hindrances to determined and zealous progress on the path to enlightenment:

> Whatever comes along, don't accept any of it. One thought of doubt, and instantly the demon [Māra] enters your mind. When even a Bodhisattva doubts, the demon of birth-and-death takes advantage.[1]

> Someone asked: "What is the state in which the four [elements and four phases] are formless?" The master said, "An instant of doubt in your mind and you're obstructed by earth; an instant of lust in your mind and you're drowned by water; an instant of anger in your mind and you're scorched by fire; an instant of joy in your mind and you're blown about by wind."[2]

The unenlightened mind is characterized by doubts:

> When someone brings forward a phrase or comes forth from within the concealed or revealed, you are at once beset by doubt, appeal to heaven, appeal to earth, run to question your neighbors, and are utterly bewildered.[3]

To have no doubts is a precondition for enlightenment:

> Followers of the Way, if you wish to be Dharma as is, just have no doubts.[4]

---

1. ZGI, p. 330; Sasaki, p. 17.

2. ZGI, p. 329; Sasaki, p. 15.

3. ZGI, p. 330; Sasaki, pp. 16-17.

4. ZGI, p. 354; Sasaki, p. 39.

Being free from doubt also characterizes the enlightened mind. Lin-chi says of himself:

> I see penetratingly, and am free from all doubt.[1]

One antidote for doubt for Lin-chi is "great resolve."[2] Another is correct practice, which is to "desist from thinking, and never seek outside. If something should come, illumine it."[3] Doubt is thus connected with thinking, and can be countered by a practice of non-thinking, the foundation of which is faith in one's true Mind and its activity.

Lin-chi's rather conventional notions about doubt contrast markedly with Ta-hui's much more creative use of and interest in the concept. The contrast with Lin-chi here is strong: Lin-chi creatively attributes new meanings to "faith," while neither showing much interest in nor going beyond the customary teaching about "doubts." Ta-hui, while continuing at times to imbue "faith" with Lin-chi's ultimate meanings, shows his true originality in the new meaning he gives to "doubt."

Doubts, for Ta-hui, are first of all hindrances to enlightenment. They must be destroyed, eliminated. Doubting the Way is the greatest of hindrances:

---

1. ZGI, p. 323; Sasaki, p. 11.

2. ZGI, p. 330; Sasaki, p. 17.

3. ZGI, p. 330; Sasaki, p. 17.

> So often those who don't have wisdom doubt the Way or fear emptiness; they spend months and years this way. It would have been better if they had [spent that time] reading sūtras or reciting Buddha's name; they surely are pitiful fellows![1]

In another passage we also find a quote from the Hua-yen sūtra giving the traditional view that doubts are harmful and to be cut off:

> Gradually establish the boundless practice gate, and cause all sentient beings to cut off all doubts.[2]

Why is it so important to eliminate doubts? As Ta-hui says in a letter to a layman:

> If you don't destroy your doubt, life and death will succeed each other unceasingly. If your doubt is destroyed, then the mind of life and death will be cut off (brought to an end).[3]

Doubts, however, are unavoidable for the unenlightened mind: those who haven't proved the truth of the Buddha's Dharma experientially cannot be without doubts. Doubts arise because of the nature of samsaric mind itself:

> Sudhana did not give rise to doubt when everything seemed to be going according to his ideas; but when he saw Wu-yen-tzu Wang (King Anala of Tāladhvaja) punishing criminals with endless sufferings, he suddenly doubted, finding what he saw unacceptable.[4]

---

1. P'u Shuo, p. 436a-b.

2. Letters, p. 84.

3. Letters, p. 130.

4. This incident is found in Taishō 10, pp. 355b-56c.

Now sentient beings take the mind that follows life and death as their abode. When something pleases it, they don't think about it. When something is unpleasing, they give rise to doubt. Surely you know that for the teachers, advancing, retreating, the pleasing and the unpleasing all are skillful means. Among Sudhana's teachers there was one named Triumphing-over-heat Brāhman. The place where this brāhman was was surrounded on four sides by fierce fires, so that it was like a volcano. In the center there was a sword mountain of limitless height. When Sudhana met him,... Triumphing-over-heat said, "Good youth, if today you can climb this sword mountain and throw your body into the fire, then all of your Bodhisattva deeds will be pure." When Sudhana heard these words he felt great doubt and fear. He said to himself, "To obtain a human body is difficult, to depart from all calamities is difficult, to encounter teachers is difficult. Is this not a messenger of devils? Is this not a fierce devil appearing in the form of a teacher and a Bodhisattva, wanting to make it difficult for me to build good roots, to draw me into entering all of the evil paths, to obstruct my way into the Buddha's Dharma?"

Sudhana had just in this fashion given rise to doubtful mind when there appeared in space a heavenly dragon spirit who warned him saying, "Good youth, don't form this thought. When the five fires burn the body of this brāhman, the light of the fire shines all the way to where I have my palace, making all its glorious decorations look like clots of black ink [by comparison]." He went on to speak in such a way as to make Sudhana feel no doubt and regret. As Sudhana listened he felt the pain of a cutting self-reproach, and said [to Triumphing-over-heat], "About you, good teacher, I thought bad thoughts. I only hope that you will accept my repentance...." Sudhana then climbed the sword mountain, and threw his body down into the fire. When he was just about to hit the center, he obtained "Bodhisattva Good-dwelling Samādhi." When he had just touched the fire, he obtained the "Samādhi of the Bodhisattva's quiet enjoyment of magical powers."[1]

---

1. P'u Shuo, p. 459a. This story appears in Taishō 10, pp. 346a-48a.

The point of this passage is that doubts arise when things seem to be going against the desires of the samsaric mind, and they are connected intimately with fear.

Doubts, pertaining as they do to the samsaric mind, can be eliminated by enlightenment.[1] Enlightenment is the destruction of the mind of doubt. Before Ta-hui met Yüan-wu, no matter how hard he practiced Ch'an, he couldn't destroy his doubt. After his enlightenment, he "did not doubt the Buddha, the patriarchs, or the hua-t'ou of the Ch'an teachers of the empire."[2] The one who has really reached the realm of no doubts is enlightened.[3]

Thus far Ta-hui has not gone beyond the teaching of Lin-chi about doubts. The advance of Ta-hui's teaching beyond that of his famous predecessor is expressed in two additional points which Ta-hui stresses: First, that all doubts are in fact one doubt; second, that a hua-t'ou is an instrument that arouses in our mind a doubt, that doubt which is a failure to understand the paradoxical truth it expresses.

So long we we have not broken through to an understanding of it, we have a doubt where the truth expressed in that hua-t'ou is concerned. That one doubt is all doubts. If we focus our attention on that one doubt and destroy it, then all of the doubts will be in that instant destroyed. One's enlightenment will be in proportion to one's doubt:

---

1. Letters, pp. 85-86; Letters, pp. 186-87.

2. P'u Shuo, p. 418b.

3. Letters, pp. 186-87.

"A great doubt must be followed by a great enlightenment."[1] If, on the other hand, we allow ourselves to give rise to a multiplicity of doubts when we read sūtras, teachings, or the kung-an of ancient masters, or allow doubts to arise in the daily turmoil of our lives, then the instrument of focused doubt provided by the hua-t'ou will be blunted, and we will merely remain ensnared by doubts:

> If you don't destroy your doubt, life and death will succeed each other unendingly. If your doubt is destroyed, then the mind of life and death will be cut off....Only fix your mind onto [the hua-t'ou] "dried dung-stick"....Of the first importance is that you must not turn to externals and give rise to other doubts. If you can destroy the doubt contained in the "dried dung-stick" hua-t'ou, then doubts as numerous as the sands of the Ganges river will be destroyed at the same time.[2]

> Tell him [Lü Pen-chung] that a thousand doubts, ten thousand doubts, all are only one doubt. If he breaks through a hua-t'ou, doubt as to whether we are annihilated or not after death will dissolve like ice melting.[3]

> One thousand doubts, ten thousand doubts, all only are one doubt. If on your hua-t'ou your doubt is broken through, then one thousand or ten thousand doubts are at once destroyed... If you abandon your hua-t'ou and give rise to doubts in connection with other writings, with sūtras, with the kung-an of the ancients, or in connection with your day-to-day worries, [those will become for you] the devil's companions.[4]

---

1. P'u Shuo, p. 429a.

2. Letters, p. 130.

3. Letters, p. 133.

4. Letters, p. 127.

Doubt can destroy doubts, but only if all of our doubting energy is focused on it. This is the function of the hua-t'ou.[1]

E. Other Functions of the Hua-t'ou

In addition to raising and focusing doubt, the hua-t'ou has other important functions.[2] Its most central contribution to the process of reaching enlightenment is that it cuts off thought, and makes room for a purely mental concentration in which no thought arises. It does this by asking the mind to concentrate on an object about which it cannot think, an object which always points beyond thought to the ineffable thinker that cannot be an object of thought:

> If you don't know where you came from, or where you will go [after death], then your enlightened Mind is clouded and deluded. But exactly this moment of being clouded and deluded is not something other [than enlightenment]; just go to that point and look into a hua-t'ou. A monk asked Yün-men, "What is the Buddha?" Yün-men replied, "A dried dung-stick." Just raise this hua-t'ou before you. When suddenly

---

1. Only one famous hua-t'ou is attributed to Ta-hui himself. Holding up a bamboo comb, he would say to his students: "If you call this a bamboo comb, you are wrong. If you don't call this a bamboo comb, you are also wrong. You must not say anything, but you must not remain silent." Cf. P'u Shuo, p. 425b-c. This is known as "the bamboo comb hua-t'ou." Kagamishima Genryū has suggested in his Dōgen Zenji no inyō kyōten, goroku no kenkyū, that hua-t'ou practice was born out of the mixture of chiao-wai pieh-ch'uan 教外別傳 and chiao-Ch'an i-chih 教禪一致 thought. Ta-hui, who, as we have seen above, combines these two tendencies, is given credit by Ishii Shūdō for completing the historical process of the development of the hua-t'ou. Ishii suggests that in Ta-hui's stress on hua-t'ou practice Ta-hui emphasizes the importance of developing wisdom (Prajña, hui 慧) more than the importance of developing concentration (samadhi, ting 定) on the path to enlightenment. Cf. Ishii Shūdō, "Daie Sōkō to sono deshitachi (go)," JIBS XXII, No. 1 (Dec., 1973), pp. 291-95.

2. Letters, p. 127.

all your techniques are exhausted, you will be enlightened....Only move your deluded mind onto the [hua-t'ou] "dry dung stick" and fix it there. The mind that fears life and death, the deluded mind, the mind of rational thought and distinctions, the mind that wants to be smart, naturally won't be able to function. When you become aware that [these other aspects of mind] won't do, don't be afraid of "falling into emptiness." Suddenly, facing the place where your attention is fixed, cut off all "news," and the unsurpassed joy and peace will appear. When you succeed in the cutting off of "news," you won't be hindered any more by giving rise to views about the Buddha, the Dharma, or sentient beings, by thought and distinctions, by being intelligent, by explaining the truth rationally.[1]

The truth [Dharma] cannot be mastered by seeing, hearing and thinking. If it is, it is no more than seeing, hearing and thinking--it is not seeking after the truth itself. For the truth is not what you hear from others or learn through understanding. Now keep yourself away from all that you have seen, heard and thought, and see what you have within yourself--emptiness only, nothingness, which eludes your grasp and to which you cannot fix your thought. Why? Because this is the place to which the senses can never reach. If this place were within their reach, it would be something you could think of and glimpse; it would then be something subject to the law of birth and death.

The main thing is to shut off all your sense-organs and make your consciousness like a block of wood. When this block of wood suddenly stirs and makes a noise, that is the moment when you feel like a lion roaring in the wilds, or an elephant crossing a stream regardless of its swift current. At that moment there is no fidgeting, no doing, just this and no more....

You should know that you enter the path by seeing, hearing and thinking, and that by seeing, hearing and thinking you are also prevented from entering.

---

1. Letters, pp. 130-31.

Why? If you wield the double-bladed sword that destroys and resuscitates life in your seeing, hearing and thinking, you will be able to make good use of your eyes, ears and mind. But if the sword that cuts both ways, that destroys as well as resuscitates, is missing, your seeing, hearing and thinking will be a great stumbling block, which will cause you to fall again and again to the ground. Your truth-eye will be completely blinded; You will be walking in complete darkness, not knowing how to be free and independent. If you want, however, to be the free master of yourself by doing away with your seeing, hearing and thinking, stop your hankering monkey-like mind from doing mischief; keep it quietly under control; keep it firmly collected regardless of what you are doing--sitting or lying, standing or walking, remaining silent or talking; keep your mind stretched taut like a line; do not let it slip out of your hand. Just as soon as it slips put of your control, you will find it in the service of seeing, hearing and thinking. In such a case, is there any remedy, and if so, what is it? A monk asked Yün-men, "Who is the Buddha?" "The dried dung-stick." This is the remedy.[1]

If you want to understand completely, you must break-through in this one thought. Then you will bring samṣāra to an end and for the first time be able to speak of "awakening and entering". But you must not preserve your mind and wait for enlightenment. If you concentrate your mind on the idea of breaking through, then you will never break through. You must all at once put down the mind of delusion, the mind of thought and distinctions, the mind that loves life and hates death, the mind that enjoys quiet and hates noise, and then only at that place of putting down look into a hua-t'ou. The monk asked Chao-chou, "Does the dog have the Buddha-Nature or not?" Chao-chou replied, "No." This one word is a weapon to conquer many evil thoughts and opinions. You mustn't understand

1. P'u Shuo, p. 410b ; translated by D.T. Suzuki, in Essays in Zen Buddhism, Second Series (London: Rider and Co., 1970) pp. 100-102.

> it as the "non-being" of "being and non-being," nor as being a "truth" [you can reason about]....Only at all times throughout the twenty-four hours, whatever you are doing, raise it and work on it. "Does a dog have the Buddha-Nature?" Answer: "No." Without leaving your daily activities, try making this kind of effort and see. In a month or even ten days, you will see for yourself. The official duty of a prefecture of a thousand li won't be a hindrance to you.[1]

Still another important function of the hua-t'ou is as a corrective to harmful tendencies of the mind in meditation. One harmful tendency of the mind is to create an object of its own on which to concentrate in meditation and thereby hinder the seeing of that which cannot be an object of thought; the mind is always trying to place some imaginary product between itself and enlightenment.

> Just be at ease 24 hours a day. If an old habit-impediment arises, don't use your mind to expel it. Just look into a hua-t'ou: "Does the dog have Buddha-Nature or not?" At this instant, the impediment will disappear like a flake of snow hitting a flame.[2]

Another is to sink into dullness or obscurity:

> Try when you are in a noisy place looking into the hua-t'ou, "A dog does not have a Buddha-Nature." Don't worry about whether you are experiencing enlightenment or not; when your mind is troubled and disturbed, then grasp this [hua-t'ou] and look at it. Are you then aware of quietness or not? Are you still aware of gaining strength or not? If you are aware of gaining strength, then you must not abandon [the hua-t'ou]. When you want to practice quiet sitting, then light one stick of incense and sit quietly. While you are sitting, don't let your

---

1. Letters, pp. 50-51. A li is a Chinese measure of distance.

2. Letters, pp. 92-93.

> mind sink into obscurity, but also don't raise [your mind]. Sinking into obscurity and falling and raising are what the sages of old most advised against. If when you are practicing quiet sitting, you become aware that these two maladies are appearing, then you have only to take up the hua-t'ou "Does the dog have the Buddha-Nature? No." You must not try forcibly to get rid of these two maladies, for they will soon become submissive and settle down of themselves.[1]

There is, however, a danger in using the hua-t'ou to correct the mind's tendency to seek objects of thought. The danger, of course, lies in the fact that one is likely to make discriminations in the effort to end discriminations. It is the fact that the hua-t'ou lies outside the realm of discriminations that makes it so useful in combatting them; but this must be done in a non-discriminating fashion:

> You write: "In performing my duties I daily walk in the realm of distinctions, but I have never left [the realm of] the Buddha's Law." You also say: "In the midst of my daily activities I use the hua-t'ou 'the dog has no Buddha-Nature' to clear away the dust of emotions." If you practice like that, you'll never be enlightened! Please look under your feet: from where does the realm of distinctions arise? In your activities and surroundings, how can you use this hua-t'ou to clear away impediments of emotion? Who is it who is able to know that you are clearing away emotional impediments?
>
> The Buddha said, "Sentient beings are overcome, they delude themselves and follow things." Things originally have no self-nature. The deluded cause themselves to chase after them. Realms originally have no distinctions. Those who delude themselves create the distinctions. You say that you daily walk in the realm of distinctions but are in the midst of Buddha's Law. If you are in the midst of the Buddha's Law, then that is not in the realm of distinctions. If you

---

1. Letters, pp. 57-58.

> are in the midst of the realm of distinctions, then that is not the Buddha's Law. If you keep on grabbing onto the one and letting the other go, there will be no end to it.
>
> When in the midst of your daily activities, you become aware that you are walking in the realm of distinctions, just at that point of distinction, raise the hua-t'ou "the dog has no Buddha-Nature." Don't think about clearing away, don't think about emotional impediments. Don't think about distinctions. Don't think about the Buddha's Law. Just look into "the dog has no Buddha-Nature." Just raise this "no" (wu) in your mind. You mustn't preserve your mind and await enlightenment. If you preserve your mind and wait for enlightenment, then everything becomes discriminations. If you want to overcome this illness, then look at the word "no" (wu).[1]

Ta-hui emphasizes over and over that the hua-t'ou is effective. As long as one pursues the hua-t'ou urgently and uninterruptedly, without undue strain but also without relaxation,[2] then the hua-t'ou will spontaneously and naturally clear away delusion in the mind and allow its true nature to be revealed.

> Don't interrupt your practice for a moment. All the time, when you are walking or standing or sitting or lying, look into your hua-t'ou. When you are studying, or reading histories, or cultivating benevolence, righteousness, propriety, wisdom and trustworthiness, when you are serving your superiors or criticising students or eating or drinking, struggle with [your hua-t'ou].[3]

---

1. Letters, pp. 153-58.

2. Letters, pp. 151-52; Letters, pp. 185-86; P'u Shuo, p. 429a.

3. Letters, pp. 151-52.

Hua-t'ou practice is easy to begin, because one begins by using one's ordinary thinking mind to think about it.[1] Sooner or later the hua-t'ou will baffle the thinking mind; all its tricks and all its resources will be exhausted. This is progress: since what you are trying to find is the self that is the subject, not the object, of consciousness, mental consciousness and its products merely distract. The challenge is not to turn back at the point of exhaustion, not to be afraid of one's mind being "empty," not to be discouraged by the feeling of boredom, of frustration, but to entrust oneself completely to the process, "throwing away body and life."[2] The hua-t'ou upāya is the "skillful means" to enlightenment as long as one is able to stick to it uninterruptedly through to the end. It may seem difficult, but in fact the true practice of the hua-t'ou is a growing effortlessness; the place where you "save strength," said Ta-hui, is the place where you "gain strength":[3]

> When you hold up a hua-t'ou, there is no need for any skill or talent--there is no trick to it. Just don't let anything interrupt it as you go about your daily activities. Don't make any distinction between pleasure or anger or sadness or joy. Keep on with your hua-t'ou. When you feel that reason is no use, that there's no flavor to thinking about it any more, and your mind feels flustered and bored, that is the moment at which you should throw away body and life. Remember that. Don't give up and turn back when you reach this point. This [mental frustration] is the sign of becoming a Buddha or a patriarch.[4]

---

1. Letters, p. 141.

2. Letters, p. 173.

3. Letters, pp. 185-186.

4. Letters, p. 86.

> Whether you are walking, sitting or lying, let your mind be perpetually fixed on this dried dung-stick [hua-t'ou]. The time will come when your mind will suddenly come to a stop like an old rat in a cul-de-sac. Then there will be a plunging into the unknown with the cry, "Ah, this!" When this cry is uttered, you have discovered yourself. You find at the same time that all the teachings of the ancient worthies expounded in the Buddhist Tripitaka, the Taoist scriptures and the Confucian classics, are no more than commentaries upon your own sudden cry, "Ah this!"[1]

Unlike later Ch'an and Zen masters, Ta-hui did not teach the development of enlightenment through the penetration of a graded series of hua-t'ou; he certainly made no effort to work out such a series, and he taught that when one hua-t'ou was truly understood, all were simultaneously understood. Nonetheless his own experience of enlightenment under Yüan-wu was deepened by working on a second hua-t'ou after having made some kind of breakthrough on the first, so it is possible that the difference was more of concept and terminology and the lack of systemization than of actual practice.[2]

F. The Layman and Hua-t'ou Practice

Was it possible, as Ta-hui insisted, that hua-t'ou practice could be carried out by laymen uninterruptedly in the midst of their daily activities? Was perhaps the daily practice of quiet sitting or "silent illumination" in fact not more suited to the conditions of lay life than hua-t'ou practice? Hua-t'ou practice had the clear advantage of

---

1. P'u Shuo, p. 410b. Trans. by D.T. Suzuki, Essays in Zen Buddhism, Second Series, p. 100.

2. Letters, pp. 36-37.

not removing Buddhist practice from the world, even for an hour; laymen had no need to seek out a quiet place to carry on such a practice, and so were not temped to distinguish between the "real" in quiet and retirement and the "worldly forms" in duty and disturbance. But did not a practice that required one to concentrate one's mind on a frustrating object of thought tend to preclude certain kinds of lay activity? Ta-hui, as we have seen in the passage quoted on page 213 and in other passages, clearly thought not. One could keep one's mind on a hua-t'ou in the midst of all kinds of activities. Furthermore, the emotional force of the doubt raised and focused by the hua-t'ou would create a preoccupation with the hua-t'ou that would continue as an ever-present undercurrent, whatever else one might be doing. An apparently absurd and irrelevant question would become one's own question. Entering deeply into one's mind, it would become the focus of all doubt and all ignorance, until finally it was spontaneously answered. Throughout this process the layman could continue to perform his normal tasks.

In Conclusion

As we have seen, Ta-hui's response as a Ch'an master to the cultural and intellectual currents of his time were not those of a defender of a beleagured faith. Rather, as I have tried to suggest, Ta-hui was an active, dynamic and effective teacher of Buddhist enlightenment who was fully engaged in the cultural life of his time. He was concerned to reach out to lay men and women both to assist them in their own progress toward enlightenment and to enable the wisdom gained in Buddhist enlightenment to inform their lives as leaders of Southern Sung culture.

In his insistence on the efficacy of hua-t'ou practices Ta-hui was concerned to clarify the teachings of his own tradition. In his comments on meaning and self-cultivation in the Confucian and Taoist traditions, he offered his own understanding of what he saw as the deepest elements of other strands of the cultural context in which he lived. As we have seen, in carrying out both of these activities of clarification Ta-hui offered trenchant criticisms. He also entertained great hopes that he could persuade those who practiced silent illumination and those who found their security in "learning" to see the futility of their paths, and to seek enlightenment. In these hopes he found more to unite him to his Confucian Tao-hsüeh acquaintances than to divide him from them. For they too sought a direct path to sagehood; they too were convinced that learning should lead to a stability and depth of character, a selfless wisdom and compassion, which would make them truly able to respond to the world's needs.

In conclusion, I offer the following summary of the major points which

have been offered, and which the writer believes the evidence presented to support:

1. That Ta-hui's teachings, both in form and content, showed his strong and continuing desire to spread the teachings of Ch'an theory and practice to laymen.

2. That Ta-hui did not believe in separate teaching for laymen, but tried to bring laymen to enlightenment by teaching Ch'an practice to monastic and lay students at the same time and using virtually identical doctrines and practices.

3. That Ta-hui's strong sense of the universality of Buddhist teaching and practice was one factor in his reaching out to laymen.

4. That Ta-hui was associated closely with members of the Neo-Confucian movement in its second formative period. Further, that he showed an active desire to steer scholar-officials away from certain kinds of intellectual errors that hindered their realization of truth and enlightenment.

5. That Ta-hui was one of the first Buddhists of record to see the paths of the "Three Teachings" as similar in their experiential or transformative dimensions, not merely in their ethical prescriptions. Further, he was one of the first Buddhist advocates of the view that the "Three Teachings" were similar who did not reserve for Buddhism a special superiority. That Ta-hui's espousal of the view that the "Three Teachings" lead to the same goal was related to his involvement in the teaching of laymen, and particularly of Confucian shih-tai-fu.

6. That Ta-hui's major contribution to the Lin-chi Ch'an tradition, his development of a theoretical understanding of and prescription for hua-t'ou

practice, found expression in his letters and sermons to laymen, and may be related to his insistence that Ch'an practice toward enlightenment can be carried out without leaving the activities of everyday life.

An Historical Note

The Ch'an school in China from the late Southern Sung to the present has borne the stamp that Ta-hui and his Sung colleagues placed upon it. *Hua-t'ou* practice toward a moment of enlightenment has remained the chief form of Ch'an practice. It is so much a part of Ch'an and Zen practice that it seems almost synonymous with Ch'an itself. *Hua-t'ou* practice, which reached its full development with Ta-hui, has continued to be understood very much as Ta-hui understood and taught it. The understanding of the *hua-t'ou* or *kung-an* as a focus of doubt, and of concentrated doubt as a force leading to enlightenment, has remained central. Ta-hui's *Letters* and his *Yü-lu* have circulated widely in China, and in Korea and Japan, as guides to practice. Ch'an masters in later periods, such as Han-shan 憨山 (1546-1623) looked back to Ta-hui as one of the two or three last great masters of Ch'an's golden age.

Chinese Ch'an also continued to take its practice and its message to laymen, although never again perhaps with the same sense of urgency. The hope that the character of elite culture could be transformed and deepened by a turn toward enlightenment remained, although after the end of the Sung it never blazed as brightly again in Ch'an circles.

The response of four major figures of later time to Ta-hui's activities and teachings reflect four significant dimensions of the fate and consequences of his efforts.

One great figure who acknowledged Ta-hui's influence upon his own life and for a full attainment and stressed the importance of Ta-hui's teaching was the Korean Sŏn (Ch'an) monk Chinul 知訥 (1158-1210), a

man who had a strong formative influence upon the Chogye Order of Korean Sŏn Buddhism. During the period between 1197 and 1200 Chinul read a copy of Ta-hui's Yü-lu. Chinul is quoted as saying of this experience:

> Even though, for more than ten years since my days at Pomun Monastery, I had never squandered time but had been engaged in diligent cultivation with proper understanding, the illusory views had not been (completely) removed from me yet. Something was still sticking to my heart like an obstacle, as if I were staying with an enemy. But when I came to dwell in Chiri Mountain and acquired a copy of the Recorded Sayings of Ch'an Master Ta-hui P'u-chüeh, which said, "Ch'an does not exist at a quiet place; it does not exist where one responds to daily affairs, nor where thought and discrimination occur. Nevertheless, above all you should study Ch'an without leaving such places....Once your eyes are opened suddenly, you will realize that this is just like things happening inside your own house." Now this fitted in with my understanding. The obstacle naturally no longer stuck to my heart, and the enemy was gone; and I felt comfortable immediately.[1]

Chinul went on to recommend Ta-hui's hua-t'ou practice, which he called the "path of direct cutting" as the supreme path, "the perfection of Ch'an," and the remedy for "the disease of intellectual understanding."[2] Chinul and his followers gave Ta-hui's writings a prominent place in the Korean Sŏn tradition.

A second heir to Ta-hui's influence, the Japanese Rinzai master Hakuin, saw very clearly the positive side of Ta-hui's influence upon

---

1. Chinul, Pojo pŏbŏ 普照法語, edited by Kim T'anho 金呑虛. Seoul, 1963 (quoted in Keel, p. 131; I have made some changes in Keel's translation).

2. Keel, pp. 133 and 175.

the Rinzai tradition. He particularly praised Ta-hui's efforts to combat "silent illumination" practice.[1] In continuing Ta-hui's teaching on kung-an or hua-t'ou practice and the efficacy of doubt, often in the very language which Ta-hui used, Hakuin testified to the truth and efficacy of Ta-hui's path to enlightenment. It is undoubtedly through Hakuin and his Rinzai followers that Ta-hui's teaching has been most clearly kept alive and brought to the attention of the wider world.

Another near contemporary of Ta-hui, the founder of the Japanese Sōtō Zen school Dōgen Kigen 道元希玄 (1200-1253) reacted strongly against Ta-hui's teachings and activities as he saw them reflected in the late Southern Sung Ch'an of Ta-hui's Dharma-heirs in China. What others might regard as Ta-hui's major contributions to the development of Chinese Ch'an, to Dōgen seemed to have been the seeds of ruin. Reaching out to laymen meant to Dōgen only corrupt involvement with wealthy patrons and court intrigue. Seeking agreement among the Three Teachings meant to Dōgen only a neglect of pure Ch'an practice, a turning toward scholarly and literary pursuits, and a watering down of the uniqueness of Buddhist teaching. Ta-hui had not been unaware of the dangers of Ch'an involvement in shih-tai-fu culture, but he had hoped through vigorous efforts to purge in some measure both Ch'an and shih-tai-fu culture of the faults attendant upon their literary and scholarly inclinations. Dōgen saw only the unfortunate results. In addition, Dōgen's later followers regarded

---

1. Cf. Philip Yampolsky, ed. and trans., The Zen Master Hakuin: Selected Writings (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971), pp. 14, 26, 104 and 115.

Ta-hui's outspoken condemnation of "silent illumination Ch'an" as an attack upon their own tradition.

Chu Hsi (1130-1200), one of the great synthesizers of Tao-hsüeh, read and referred several times to Ta-hui's Yü-lu; it seems to have been one of the few Buddhist books with which Chu Hsi was thoroughly acquainted. Chu Hsi also may have studied Ch'an with one of Ta-hui's Dharma-heirs. Chu Hsi regarded Ta-hui as sometimes more rational in his explanations of Buddhist truth than other Ch'an teachers, but objected strongly to Ta-hui's advocacy of hua-t'ou practice as a means of avoiding the pitfalls of rationnality in one's quest for enlightenment. Chu Hsi's teaching of a way to Confucian enlightenment (chüeh 覺) through reasoned self-inspection and self-correction helped to bring about the eventual lessening of the rapproachement between Confucian scholars and Ch'an monks that had seemed so promising and fruitful during the early Southern Sung. What had been at least in part an interaction of mutual discovery, of shared experience within one culture, became once again on the Confucian side an argument across defined lines of orthodoxy and heterodoxy.

The idea that "the Three Teachings return to one," and the implication that Buddhist, Confucian and Taoist teachings and practice could coexist as three strands of one culture, as various ways of fostering and interpreting similar experiential realizations, has continued to enjoy wide acceptance with important consequences. Ch'an has continued to make significant direct and indirect contributions to the way that educated men and women understood their religious and personal experience. But Ch'an enlightenment itself has seemed to most to be a goal that must be sought apart from everyday life.

Appendix A

The surviving works that are attributed to Ta-hui fall into four categories: 1) Recorded Sayings (Yü-lu) in 30 chüan; 2) the Tsung-men wu-k'u (Ch'an Arsenal) and the Recorded Sayings in two chüan; 3) P'u Shuo (Sermons); and 4) Treasury of the True Dharma Eye (Cheng-fa-yen-tsang).[1] The works in categories 1 and 3 proved to be of great importance as sources for Ta-hui's thought as it pertained to the teaching of laymen; the works in categories 2 and 4 proved to be of very little use to the kind of investigation undertaken. In the following, I will discuss briefly the results of Professor Ishii Shūdō's and my own investigation into the origins and history of the extant and reprinted texts in each of the four categories.

1. The first category is the Recorded Sayings in 30 chüan.[2] This work can be divided into four sections, each of which at one time circulated separately. But, apparently very much in the form in which it now exists, it was added on the Emperor Hsiao Tsung's instruction to both the K'ai-yüan Ssu 開元寺 and the Tung Ssu 東寺 editions of the Tripitaka in 1171-72, only eight or nine years after Ta-hui's death, and was reprinted in every Chinese edition of the Tripitaka thereafter. It was the only Recorded Sayings of an individual Ch'an master to be included in the Sung canon, and one of only four to be

---

1. For full citation information on the texts discussed in this appendix see Bibliography. Part I, below.

2. The information in this section is drawn largely from Ishii Shūdō. "Daie goroku no kisoteki kenkyū (jo)," Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyō Gakubu kenkyū kiyō No. 31, (March, 1973), pp. 283-92.

included in the Ming canon.[1] Its addition to the Sung canon occurred even though the canon had been officially finished at the Tung Ssu in 1121 and at the K'ai-yüan Ssu in 1148. No copies of this work in either of these two Sung canon editions exist now, but there are several early Japanese copies of the Sung canon version. The version now included in the Taishō shinshū daizōkyō is a copy of a version included in the Ming canon, as is the Shukuzōkyō version. The editors of the Taishō state that they checked this Ming edition against two Japanese copies of the Sung canon version; Ishii has found that in fact one of the copies they used to check the Ming edition must have been a genuine edition (now lost) from the Sung K'ai-yüan Ssu canon, not a Japanese copy.[2] Another edition, broken up into its four separate parts, has been reprinted in the Zokuzōkyō. Ishii concludes that the Zokuzōkyō text is based on a Japanese edition which did not circulate as part of a canon, and which was published in 1647, or on an edition based on that edition, and not on the Ming canon version.[3] If in fact the Taishō text were to have been checked against a Sung canon text, it would be the most reliable of the three texts available to me, and therefore is the one cited. The texts in the Zokuzōkyō and the Taishō are remarkably

---

1. Cf. Yanagida Seizan, "Daizōkyō to Zenroku no nyūzō," JIBS XX, No. 1 (Dec., 1971), p. 83.

2. Ishii, "Daie goroku no kisoteki kenkyū (jo)," p. 285.

3. Ibid., p. 288.

similar, however, as would be expected in the case of a work which entered the canon less than ten years after Ta-hui's death.[1]

The first of the four parts of the category one work is the Recorded Sayings (Yü-lu), which compose the first twelve chuan and include at the end of the sixth chüan the "memorial inscription (t'a-ming 塔銘)" by Chang Chün. The first four chüan are "recorded sayings" from Ta-hui's first period of residence at Ching-shan; the fifth chüan is a record of his sayings at Ah-yü-wang-shan; and the sixth chüan records his sayings during his second stay at Ching-shan. The six chüan and the memorial inscription apparently at one time circulated separately as a one volume work. The seventh chüan records sayings from his period of residence at Yün-men an 雲門庵 in Kiangsi, the eighth records sayings from his period of residence at Yang-yü an 洋嶼庵 in Fukien, and the ninth records sayings from the period at Yün-chu-shan when he served as head monk under Yüan-wu. The tenth chüan consists of poems in praise of earlier Ch'an teachers, the eleventh of gāthās presented to various people, and the twelfth of poems in praise of the Buddhas and patriarchs.

---

1. The records of Ta-hui's saying were taken by different disciples at each different place; indeed, we are told that Ta-hui refused to allow any official record of his remarks to be made until the very end of his life, with the result that his disciples each took such notes as he could, and the records were thus in quite a confused state by the time anyone began to edit them. Apparently, though, one record of his sayings was compiled and began to circulate by 1147. The version we now have in the Taishō was edited by a disciple, Yün-wen 蘊聞. Other versions must have been in circulation, however. For example, an early Japanese reprint of a Sung text gives Tao-ch'ien 道謙 as the recorder, and a lay disciple Huang Wen-chang 黃文昌 as the reviser. For Ishii's reconstruction of the early history of the 30 chüan Yü-lu, see his "Daie goroku no kisoteki kenkyū (jo)," pp. 295-303.

Many of the Shang T'ang recorded in chüan 1-6 can be approximately dated, as Ishii has shown.[1] Unfortunately, these Shang T'ang have proved to be of very little value for this study.

The second section (chüan 13 through 18) of the Yü-lu in 30 chüan is called P'u Shuo, or "Sermons." This apparently also circulated separately as a work in one chüan. One clue that suggests strongly that the Zokuzōkyō version of the Yü-lu in 30 chüan did not derive from the text in the Ming canon as the versions in the Taishō and the Shukuzōkyō did is the different selection and arrangement of sermons in this section. In all in the four versions there are 14 sermons, but they share only 13 in common, and the order in which they appear is different.[2] For this reason I have used and cited both the Taishō and the Zokuzōkyō editions of this section, which for convenience I shall call the "one chüan P'u Shuo."

The third section (chüan 19-24) of the Yü-lu in 30 chüan is called Fa-yü, or "Dharma Words." This consists of instructions to individual students, including many laymen. I have compared the Taishō and Zokuzōkyō editions very closely, and they appear to be nearly identical, despite their different sources. They are divided differently into chüan, however.

The fourth and final section is called Shu, "Letters." Of all of Ta-hui's works this has been the most popular, especially in Korea, and

---

1. Ishii, "Daie goroku no kisoteki kenkyū (jo)," pp. 304-05.

2. Ibid., pp. 288-91.

it has been reprinted many times. No one has yet attempted a history of the extant early texts, a very difficult task. Therefore I have used the Taishō edition.

2. The second category of works is composed of the Yü-lu in two chüan, or Tsung-ts'a tu-hai 宗雜毒海, and the Tsung-men wu-k'u 宗門武庫 (Ch'an Arsenal) in one chüan. Both are reprinted in the Zokuzōkyō, and the Arsenal is reprinted in the Taishō. The first half of the Yü-lu in two chüan, or Tsung ts'a tu-hai, edited by Fa-hung 法宏 and Tao-ch'ien 道謙, seems to be nearly identical with the Tsung-men wu-k'u, despite its different title. The second half consists of poems eulogizing Ta-hui and written after his death. Whether Ta-hui in fact wrote the Arsenal is much disputed.[1] A preface is dated 1186. As for the Tsung-ts'a tu-hai, a problematic point is the date of the text long thought to be a Sung text which is kept in the library of Waseda University, the text on which the Zokuzōkyō edition is based. It appears that both the Taishō and the Zokuzōkyō used a Ming dynasty edition of the Arsenal.[2] For my purposes neither the Arsenal nor the Tsung-ts'a tu-hai proved useful; although an occasional anecdote from the Arsenal and the poems from the second half of the Tsung-ts'a tu-hai would be useful for a more complete study of Ta-hui's disciples, they add very little to a study

---

1. For example, Ichikawa Hakugen in his book Daie (Tokyo: Kōbundō Shobo, 1941) doubts Ta-hui's authorship (p. 200).

2. Ishii, "Daie goroku no kisoteki kenkyū (jo)," pp. 292-93.

of Ta-hui's own thought. Therefore, though I have read all three texts, have not cited them in this work.

3. The third category, which has been very important for this study, consists of the P'u Shuo in four chüan. This work, which supplements and does not duplicate the P'u Shuo in one chüan included in the 30 chüan Yü-lu, is among the most basic sources for a study of Ta-hui's thought, because it contains four times as much sermon material as that contained in the one chüan P'u Shuo. There are two early Japanese copies of Sung editions of this work.[1] One, probably the oldest, dates from the later Kamakura period and now is kept in the Dai Tōkyū Kinen Bunko. The other early complete Japanese copy, now in the Tōyō Bunko, appears to be identical to the Kamakura copy, but is printed on smaller paper. In addition there is one page in the Waseda library that may well be from the Sung edition itself; it is bound by mistake in the Waseda copy of the two chüan Yü-lu. In the early Japanese copies of the four chüan P'u Shuo there is a preface dated 1188 and a postface dated 1189 that presumably are reprinted from the Sung text. On Prof. Ishii's advice I have used the Zokuzōkyō edition, which appears to trace back to a Japanese text in the Komazawa University Library dated 1647, and have compared it with the early Japanese copy in the Tōyō Bunko, particularly in order to correct obvious mistakes in the later text.

1. On the four chüan P'u Shuo, cf. Ishii Shūdō, "Daie goroku no kisoteki kenkyū (jo)," p. 294.

The fourth category of Ta-hui's works is the Cheng-fa-yen-tsang. Here I have used the printed edition in the Zokuzōkyō, but have found the work to provide no material useful for my purposes. A Sung edition still exists for this work, which appears to have been published around 1162.[1] The Zokuzōkyō editors reprinted a Chinese Ming text dating from 1616. I have not cited or used the Cheng-fa-yen-tsang in this work, as it is limited to kōans of earlier masters and Ta-hui's extremely brief comments on them; it sheds no light on any of the subjects of this thesis.

A word remains to be said about one other text which I have used quite extensively, the Nien-p'u or "Chronology" of Ta-hui's life compiled by one of his disciples. This was compiled in 1183, and apparently printed at that time. Another disciple found so many errors in it and criticized it so strongly that the errors noted were corrected by a new editor in 1205. Today only the revised edition survives. It was attached to the 30 chüan Yü-lu and printed in the Ming Tripiṭaka. The Taishō editors dropped it from the 30 chüan Yü-lu, but the Shukuzōkyō editors, following the Ming text more exactly, did not. The text found in the Shukuzōkyō contains a few errors; I have therefore compared the passages cited with a xeroxed copy of the oldest extant Sung text, which dates from 1253, and is now in the library of Rissho University.[2] The xeroxed copy was kindly provided to me by Professor Ishii.

---

1. Cf. Ishii Shūdō, "Daie Sōkō to sono deshi-tachi (san)," JIBS XX, No. 2 (March, 1972), p. 275.

2. Ishii Shūdō, "Daie goroku no kisoteki kenkyū (jō)," pp. 298-99. For further information see p. 18 fn. 1 above.

Appendix B

In addition to the Nien-p'u, I consulted the following biographical accounts. Dates of completion are given in parentheses:

Tsung-men lien-teng hui-yao 宗門聯灯會要(1183), chüan 17, Zokuzōkyō 2, 9, 4, pp. 350d-54a.

This account of Ta-hui's life and teachings contains a very brief biographical introduction, a lengthy account of his enlightenment under Yüan-wu, and many quotations.

Wu-teng hui-yüan 五燈會元 (1252), chüan 19, Zokuzōkyō 2, 11, 4, pp. 376b-79d.

This excellent short biography summarizes the major events in Ta-hui's life, and gives long excerpts from important sermons. It agrees with the Nien-p'u on every important detail.

Wu-teng hui-yüan, chüan 20, Zokuzōkyō 2, 11, 4, pp. 394d-403c.

This gives short biographies of Ta-hui's Dharma-heirs. Some of these give lengthy accounts of how the monk in question came to be enlightened under Ta-hui's instruction. Included is the monk whom Ta-hui first challenged in Fukien, as well as the laymen Chang Chiu-ch'eng, Li Ping (Li Han-lao), Liu Tzu-hsi, Wu Yüan-chao 吳元昭, Huang yen-chieh 黄彥節 and Chang Chün's mother.

Chia-t'ai p'u-teng lu 嘉泰普燈錄 (1205), chüan 15, Zokuzōkyō 2, 10, 2, pp. 1132-115c.

This has a rather lengthy biography of Ta-hui under the category of Dharma-heirs of Yüan-wu. This biography gives 13 as Ta-hui's age when he entered the local school, whereas the biography in Wu-teng hui-yüan gives 12 as his age at that time. On all other important biographical points this text agrees with Wu-teng hui-yüan; in fact, the two often use identical wording.

Chia-t'ai p'u-teng lu, chüan 18, Zokuzōkyō 2, 10, 2, pp. 130d-37a.

This also gives information and biographies of Ta-hui's Dharma-heirs, though it does not include any of the laymen except for Chang Chün's mother.

Chia-t'ai p'u-teng lu, chüan 23, Zokuzōkyō 2, 10, 2, pp. 160b-61a.

This gives a biography of Chang Shang-ying. On pp. 160d-61a there appears an account of Ta-hui's first visit to him.

Chia-t'ai P'u-teng lu, chüan 18, Zokuzōkyō 2, 10, 2, pp. 162a-163d.

This gives accounts of the laymen Chang Chiu-ch'eng, Li Ping (Han-lao), Liu Tzu-hsi, Wu Yüan-chao (Wei-ming) and Huang Yen-chieh (Chieh-fu) that agree in almost all particulars with those in Wu-teng hui-yüan.

Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai 佛祖歷代通載 (1333), chüan 30, Zokuzōkyō 2, 5, 4, pp. 348b-349, or Taishō 49, pp. 689c-91a.

This biography of Ta-hui differs considerably from those contained in the Wu-teng hui-yüan and Chia-t'ai p'u-teng lu. It begins with a

story about the fate of a Buddha image in the temple where Ta-hui was first ordained. The image's fate is taken as predicting the fate of Ta-hui. (The same story appears in the Nien-p'u, p. 1b.) Like the Nien-p'u, the tone of this biography is more hagiographic than that of the Wu-teng hui-yüan biography. It contains a quote from a letter that does not appear in the Nien-p'u. It also gives an account of the reason for Ta-hui's transfer to Mei-chou and of his life there that goes beyond that given in the Nien-p'u.

Shih-shih chi-ku lüeh 釋氏稽古略, chüan 4, Zokuzōkyō 2, 6, 1, pp. 80b-84b.

This historical chronology mentions Ta-hui, Chang Chiu-ch'eng, and other lay disciples of Ta-hui.

Ts'ung-lin sheng-shih 叢林盛事, chüan A, Zokuzōkyō 2, 21, 1, pp. 33a-42c.

This has anecdotes about Ta-hui's monastic and lay Dharma-heirs, including Chang Chiu-ch'eng.

Chu-shih fen-teng lu 居士分燈錄 (1631), chüan B, Zokuzōkyō 2, 20, pp. 449d-451b.

This has information on Chang Shang-ying, including Ta-hui's visit. Pp. 458a-62c give an account of Feng Chi-ch'uan, Chang Chiu-ch'eng and various other lay disciples of Ta-hui.

Chih-yüeh lu 指月錄 (1602), chüan 31, pp. 1a-67b, and chüan 32, pp. 1a-67a.

This work contains "Lin-an-fu Ching-shan Tsung-kao Ta-hui P'u-chüeh Ch'an-shih yü-yao" in two chüan. It includes biographical information and many quotations.

I checked a few late local gazetteers in the Library of Congress to see whether they had biographies of Ta-hui. I found two. One is in the Hang-chou-fu chih 杭州府志 in 110 chüan, compiled by Cheng Yün 鄭澐 and printed in 1784. Chuan 107, p. 20a-b, quotes and cites the Chih-yüeh lu 指月錄 and Chang Chün's memorial inscription, but leaves out almost everything except a story of a miraculous dream by Ta-hui's mother, a garbled account of his early career and enlightenment under Yüan-wu, his being honored by the future Hsiao Tsung after his return to Ching-shan, and his death. The other account is in a later gazetteer from Ta-hui's birthplace, the Hsüan-ch'eng-hsien chih 宣城縣志, chuan 18, 10a-11a, by Fan Pao-lien 范葆廉, printed in 1888. This gives a more scholarly biography based on a comparative study of the accounts in other gazetteers. Neither adds anything to the information given in earlier accounts.

Appendix C

I. P'u Shuo by Ta-hui's Contemporaries and Juniors

1. In Hsüeh-t'ang Hsing Ho-shang yü 雪堂行和尚語 , a short record of the sayings of Hsüeh-t'ang Tao-hsing 雪堂道行 (1089-1151), we find two P'u Shuo recorded. In their recorded form these are both very short, 280 and 540 words respectively; they have no identifiable connection with laymen. Nonetheless, the fact that Hsüeh-t'ang is an exact contemporary of Ta-hui makes the fact that he too used the P'u Shuo form significant.[1] Hsüeh-t'ang was a disciple of Fo-yen, who also used the P'u Shuo (see Chapter V above).

2. In Shan-t'ang Hsün Ch'an-shih yü 山堂洵禪師語, a short record of the sayings of Shan-t'ang Seng-hsün 山堂僧洵 (dates unknown, but roughly contemporary with Ta-hui), we find one P'u Shuo of 560 words. In this P'u Shuo also there is no indication of lay sponsorship or lay hearers.[2] Shan-t'ang was in the Huang-lung line.

3. In Fu-chou Hsüeh-feng Tung-shan Ho-shang yü-lu 福州雪峰東山和尚語錄 two P'u Shuo by Hsüeh-feng Hui-k'ung 雪峰慧空 are recorded. Both are short: one is 180 words, the other 400. No

---

1. Hsüeh-t'ang Hsing Ho-shang yü is in Hsü-k'ai ku-tsun-su yü-yao, chüan 4, Zokuzōkyō 2, 23, 5, pp. 64b-68a; there are two P'u Shuo on pp. 66b-67a.

2. Shan-t'ang Hsün Ch'an-shih yü in Hsu-k'ai ku-tsun-su yü-yao, chüan 4, Zokuzōkyō 2, 23, 5, pp. 3a-6a; there is a P'u Shuo on pp. 5b-6a.

reference is made to laymen. Hui-k'ung lived from 1096 to 1158.[1] Hui-k'ung was in the Huang-lung line.

4. In Fo-hai Hui-yüan Ch'an-shih kuang-lu 佛海慧遠禪師廣錄, chüan 3, there are three P'u Shuo by Fo-hai Hui-yüan (1103-1176). The longest is 1280 words, the others are 800 and 820 words respectively. There is no identifiable connection with laymen. Fo-hai was a disciple of Yüan-wu, who also used the P'u Shuo, and a Dharma-brother of Ta-hui.[2]

5. In P'u-an Yin-su Ch'an-shih yü-lu 普庵印肅禪師語錄 we find one P'u Shuo by P'u-an Yin-su (1115-1169), a man 26 years younger than Ta-hui but active during the latter part of Ta-hui's lifetime. This P'u Shuo was given for child novices, and contains no direct reference to laymen. It is 1120 words.[3] P'u-an was a Dharma-grandson of Fo-yen.

6. At the end of Ying-an T'an-hua yü-lu 應安曇華語錄, chüan 10, there is appended a P'u Shuo by Sung-yüan Ch'ung-yüeh 松源崇岳 (1132-1202). It is 700 words, and is a eulogy of the monk Ying-an T'an-hua (1103-1163); thus it must have been given around the time of

---

1. In Tung-shan Hui-k'ung Ch'an-shih yü-lu, Zokuzōkyō 2, 25, 2, we find two P'u Shuo on p. 140a-b.

2. Fo-hai Hui-yüan Ch'an-shih kuang-lu, Zokuzōkyō 2, 25, 5; in chüan 3, pp. 475b-477a we find three P'u Shuo.

3. P'u-an Yin-su Ch'an-shih yü-lu, Zokuzōkyō 2, 25, 3, p. 270b has a P'u Shuo.

Ta-hui's death, or shortly thereafter.[1] Ying-an T'an-hua was a Dharma-grandson of Yüan-wu. Sung-yüan Ch'ung-yüeh was a Dharma-great-great-grandson of Yüan-wu and a Dharma-grandson of Ying-an.

7. In Sung-yüan Yüeh Ch'an-shih yü 松源岳禪師語, a short record of the sayings of Sung-yüan Ch'ung-yüeh (see 6 above) we find one P'u Shuo of 124 words.[2] Here also there is no expressed connection with laymen.

8. The first P'u Shuo that I have been able to find in the Ts'ao-tung school is in Ju-ching Ch'an-shih yü-lu 如淨禪師語錄, which records sayings of Ch'ang-weng Ju-ching 長翁如淨 (1163-1228). Ju-ching was born in the year Ta-hui died, and was the teacher in China of the Japanese Sōtō teacher Dōgen 道元. In his recorded sayings there is only one P'u Shuo.[3] Dōgen testifies that his teacher was accustomed to giving P'u Shuo frequently.[4]

---

1. Ying-an T'an-hua yü-lu, Zokuzōkyō 2, 25, 8; chüan 10, p. 270b has a P'u Shuo.

2. Sung-yüan Yüeh Ch'an-shih yü, in Hsü-k'ai ku-tsun-su yü-yao; chüan 4, p. 22a-23a has a P'u Shuo.

3. Ju-ching Ch'an-shih yü-lu, also known as T'ien-t'ung Ju-ching Ch'an-shih yü-lu, Zokuzōkyō 2, 29, 5, chüan hsia, p. 488a-b has one P'u Shuo.

4. Dōgen Zenji, Eihei Kōroku 永平廣錄, chapter 2, as quoted in Mochizuki, Bukkyō daijiten, vol. 5, p. 4422: "Sometimes in the middle of the night, sometimes in the evening or after meals, no matter what time of day, (he would) either strike the drum for 'entering his chamber' and 'preach generally (P'u Shuo),' or strike the drum for Hsiao Ts'an and enter his chamber. Or else he would hit with his own hand the mallet in the Monks' Hall, and in the Illumination Hall he would 'preach generally (P'u Shuo);' when the P'u Shuo was over he would 'enter his chamber.' Or else he would hit the board outside the room of the head monk and preach generally in the head monk's room, and then when the preaching had finished enter his chamber." This sounds as if Ju-ching gave P'u Shuo not only frequently but also in total disregard of the usual forms.

II. Contemporaries Included in the Survey for Whom there were no Recorded P'u Shuo

A. Huang-lung line

1. Huang-lung Hui-nan (1002-1069) 黃龍慧南
2. Hui-t'ang Tsu-hsin (1025-1100) 晦堂祖心
3. Chen-ching K'o-wen (1025-1102) 眞淨克文
4. Ch'ao-tsung Hui-fang (1073-1129) 超宗惠方
5. Chan-t'ang Wen-chün (1069-1115) 湛堂文準
6. Tou-shuai Ts'ung-yüeh (1044-1091) 兜率從悅
7. Chüeh-fan Hui-hung (1071-1128) 覺範慧洪
8. Kuang-chien Hsing-ying (1071-1128) 廣鑒行瑛
9. Ling-yüan Wei-ch'ing (?-1117) 靈源惟清
10. Ssu-hsin Wu-hsin (1043-1114) 死心悟新
11. Ts'ao-t'ang Shan-ch'ing (1057-1142) 草堂善清
12. Ch'ang-ling Shou-cho (1065-1123) 長靈守卓
13. Shang-feng Pen-ts'ai (no dates) 上封本才
14. Pieh-feng Tsu-chen (no dates) 別峰祖珍
15. Wu-shih Chieh-shen (1080-1148) 無示介諶
16. Hsüeh-an Ts'ung-ch'in (1117-1200) 雪庵從瑾

B. Yang-ch'i line

17. Pao-ning Jen-yung (no dates) 保寧仁勇
18. K'ai-fu Tao-ning (1053-1113) 開福道寧
19. Yüeh-an Shan-kuo (1079-1152) 月庵善果
20. Fo-hsing Fa-t'ai (no dates) 佛性法泰
21. Hsia-t'ang Hui-yüan (1103-1176) 瞎堂慧遠

22. Hu-chiu Shao-lung (1077-1136) 虎丘紹隆

23. Ying-an T'an-hua (1103-1163) 應庵曇華

24. Ta-sui Yüan-ching (1065-1135) 大隨元靜

25. Chu-an Shih-kuei (1083-1146) 竹庵士珪

C. <u>Ts'ao-tung line</u>

26. Fu-jung Tao-k'ai (1043-1118) 芙蓉道楷

27. Tan-hsia Tsu-ch'un (1064-1117) 丹霞子淳

28. Hung-chih Cheng-chüeh (1091-1157) 宏智正覺

29. Chen-hsieh Ch'ing-liao (1090-1151) 眞歇清了

30. Tzu-te Hui-hui (1097-1183) 自得慧暉

31. Ku-yen Chien-pi (no dates) 古巖堅壁

D. <u>Yün-men line</u>

32. Wu-shan Ching-tuan (1030-1103) 吳山靜端

33. Miao-chan Ssu-hui (1070-1145) 妙湛思慧

34. Tz'u-shou Huai-shen (1077-1132) 慈受懷深

Glossary of Chinese and Japanese Words and Phrases

A-nou-to-lo San-miao san-p'u-t'i 阿耨多羅三藐三菩提

Ah-yü-wang-shan 阿育王山

Anhwei 安徽

an-shen-li-ming 安身立命

an-yang 安養

Chan-t'ang Wen-chün 湛堂文準

Ch'an 禪

Ch'an-shih 禪師

chang 常

Chang Chiu-ch'eng 張九成

Chang Chün 張浚

Chang Hsiao-hsiang 張孝祥

Chang Jung 張融

Chang Kao 張杲

Chang-sha 張沙

Chang Shang-ying 張商英

Chang Tsai 張載

Ch'ang an 長安

Ch'ang-weng Ju-ching 長翁如淨

Chao Ting 趙鼎

Ch'ao-chou 潮州

Chekiang 浙江

chen 貞

Cheng-ching K'o-wen 真淨克文

Chen-hsieh Ch'ing-liao 真歇清了

Ch'en Kuan 陳瓘

Ch'en T'uan 陳摶

Ch'en T'uan 陳摶

Ch'en Yüan 陳垣

Shen Yüeh 沈約

Cheng-hsin ch'eng-i 正心誠意

Cheng Yun 鄭澐

ch'eng 誠

Ch'eng 程

ch'eng cheng chüeh 成正覺

Ch'eng Hao 程灝

Ch'eng I 程頤

Ch'eng I-ch'uan 程伊川

Ch'eng-kuan 澄觀

Ch'eng Ming-tao 程明道

chi hsi liao hsi 寂兮寥兮

ch'i 氣

Ch'i 氣

Ch'i Sung 契嵩

Chia-hsün kuei hsin p'ien 家訓歸心篇

chiao Ch'an i-chih 教禪一致

Chiao-wai pieh chuan 教外別傳
Ch'iao Ting 譙定
chieh-t'o 解脫
chien-li 建立
Ch'ien 乾
Ch'ien-hsü 潛虛
chih 止
Chih 智
Chih ssu pu pien 至死不變
Chih-yen 智儼
Chin 金
Chin-chih 進之
Chin-shan 金山
Chin-shih 進士
Ch'in Kuei 秦檜
Ch'in Tsung 欽宗
Ching 敬
ching 淨
Ching-chou 荊州
ching-hsin 淨信
Ching-nan 荊南
ching-shan 淨善
Ching-shan 徑山
Ching-te Ssu 景德寺
Ching-yüan 淨源
Cho-i 著意

Chou 周
Chou I 周易
Chou Kuan hsin-i 周官新義
Chou Li 周禮
Chou Tun-i 周敦頤
Chu-an Shih-kuei 竹庵士珪
Chu-an Shih-kuei 竹庵士珪
chu-chang-ku-shih 主張顧視
Chu Hsi 朱熹
Chu-tzu Yu lei 朱子語類
Chu u 中有
ch'u chia 出家
ch'u fa hsin 初發心
ch'u-shin 出世
ch'u-shih-chien fa 出世間法
ch'uan 權
Ch'uan-chou 泉州
Chuang-tzu 莊子
chung 中
Chung 忠
Chung-fen Ming-pen 中峰明本
Chung Ni 仲尼
chung yin 中陰
chung yu 中有
Chung-yung 中庸
chüeh 覺

Chüeh-fan Hui-hung 覺範慧洪

chün-tzu 君子

Chün-tzu wu chung shih chih chien wei jen, tsao tz'u pi yü shih, tien p'ei pi yü shih

君子無終食之間違仁,造次必於是,顛沛必於是

Dōgen 道元

fa 法

fa chieh 法界

Fa-hung 法宏

fa men 法門

Fa-tsang 法藏

Fa-yen 法眼

Fa-yu 法語

Fan Chung-yen 范仲淹

fan-fu 凡夫

Fan Kuang-yuan 樊光遠

Fan Pao-lien 范褒廉

fang-chang 方丈

fang-pien 方便

Feng Chi 馮檝

Feng Chi-ch'uan 馮濟川

Feng Chung-shu 馮忠恕

Feng-shen Ch'u 奉聖初

Fo 佛

Fo-chien Hui-ch'in 佛鑑慧懃

Fo-hai Hui-yüan 佛海慧原

Fo-kuo 佛果

Fo-kuo Yüan-wu K'o-ch'in
(See Yüan-wu K'o-chin)

Fo-yen Ch'ing-yuan 佛眼清遠

Fu Chih-jou 富直柔

Fu-chou 福州

Fu-chou 涪州

Fukien 福建

Fu Pi 富弼

Hai-hui Ts'ung 海會從

Hai-hun 海昏

Hai-yin 海印

Hakuin Ekaku 白隱慧鶴

Han-lao 漢老

Han-lin 翰林

Han Shih-chung 韓世忠

Han Tzu-ts'ang 韓子蒼

Han Yu 韓愈

Hang-chou 杭州

heng 亨

Heng-chou 衡州

Heng-ch'u 橫渠

Heng-yang 衡陽

ho-pen-chüeh 合本覺

Ho-shang Kung 河上公
Hsi 奚
Hsi-ning 熙寧
Hsia 夏
Hsia-yu Ch'an 下語禪
hsiang 相
Hsiang Tzu-yin 向子諲
Hsiang-yün T'an-i 祥雲曇懿
hsiao-jen 小人
Hsiao Ts'an 小參
Hsiao Tsung 孝宗
Hsiao-ying Chung-wen 曉瑩仲温
Hsieh Liang-tso 謝良佐
hsien 賢
hsin 信
Hsin ch'uan lu 心傳錄
hsin hsing Ch'an 心性禪
hsin man ch'eng Fo 信満成佛
Hsin-men T'an-pi 心聞曇賁
hsin-pu-chi 信不及
hsin-shu 心術
hsin-te-chi 信得及
hsing 形
hsing-ming-chih-hsüeh 性命之學
hsiu shen 修身
Hsü Fu 徐俯
Hsu-ku Hsi-ling 虛谷希陵
Hsu-t'ang Chih-yu 虛堂智愚
Hsuan-ch'eng 宣城
Hsüan-chou 宣州
hsüan hsiang 玄象
Hsüeh-feng Hui-k'ung 雪峰慧空
Hsüeh-t'ang Tao-hsing 雪堂道行
Hsüeh-tou 雪竇
hsun 薰
Hsun-chin wen-chi 鐔津文集
Hsun Tzu 荀子
Hu An-kuo 胡安國
Hu-ch'in 虎丘
Hu-fa lun 護法論
Hu Yüan 胡瑗
hua-chu 化主
hua-t'ou 話頭
Hua-tsang Tsung-yen 華藏宗演
Hua-yen 華嚴
Hua-yen ching 華嚴經
Hua-yen Tsung 華嚴宗
Huai-jang 懷讓
Huang Chen 黄震
Huang Yen-chieh 黄彥節
Huang-chi ching-shih shu 皇極經世書
Huang-lung 黄龍

Huang-lung Lao-chi 黄龍老機

Huang-lung Hui-chi 黄龍晦機

Huang T'ing-chien 黄庭堅

Huang Wen-chang 黄文昌

Hui-ch'i 慧齊

Hui-jih 慧日

Hui-k'o 慧可

Hui-k'ung 慧空

Hui-neng 慧能

Hui Tsung 徽宗

hun 混

Hunan 湖南

hun-ta 昏怛

Hung-chih Cheng-chüeh 宏智正覺

Hupei 湖北

i 義

I 儀

I Ching 易經

I-ch'uan 伊川

jen 仁

jen 任

Ju-ching 如淨

Ju-fa-chieh-p'in 入法界品

Jui Tsung 睿宗

ju-shih 入世

Kaifeng 開封

K'ai-yüan 開元

K'ai-yüan Ssu 開元寺

kangwon 講院

K'ang Seng-hui 康僧會

K'ang Wang 康王

Kanwa 看話

Kao-hsiang P'u Shuo 告香普說

Kao ma T'ien 杲罵天

Kao Tsung 高宗

Kiangsi 江西

kōan 公案

ko-i 格義

ko-wu 格物

k'o-t'ou 客頭

Ku Huan 顧歡

ku-wen 古文

Kuan-tai 管帶

Kuang-chiao Shao-ch'eng 廣教紹珵

Kuang-chou 廣州

Kuang-hung-ming-chi 廣弘明集

Kuang-chih ta-shih pen-sung 廣智大師本嵩

Kuang yüan-chiao p'ien 廣原教編

Kuei-feng Tsung-mi 圭峯宗密

Kuei-tsung 歸宗

Kuei-yang 潙仰

K'un 坤

kung-an 公案

kung-fu 工夫

Kwangtung 廣東

Lao-tzu 老子

le 樂

li 里

Li 理

Li 禮

Li 利

Li Chang-che 李長者

Li Han-lao 李漢老

Li Kou 李覯

Li Kuang 李光

Li Lao 李老

Li Mi-cheng 李彌正

Li Mo 李謨

Li P'eng 李彭

Li Ping 李邴

Li Shang-lao 李商老

Li T'ung 李通

Li T'ung-hsuan 李通玄

Liang Wu-ti 梁武帝

Liao Weng 了翁

Lieh-tzu 列子

lien-shen yang-ch'i 煉身養氣

Lin-an 臨安

Lin-an-fu 臨安府

Lin-chi 臨濟

Lin-chi Hui-chao 臨濟慧照

Lin-chi I-hsüan 臨濟義玄

Lin-chi lu 臨濟錄

Lin-ch'uan 臨川

ling 靈

Liu An-shih 劉安世

Liu Ts'en 劉岑

Liu Tzu-hui 劉子翬

Liu Tzu-yü 劉子羽

Liu Tzu-yün 劉子暈

Lo Ts'ung-yen 羅從彥

Lou Chao 樓炤

Loyang 洛陽

Lü Hsi-che 呂希哲

Lü Pen-chung 呂本中

Lu-shan 廬山

Lü Tung-pin 呂洞賓

Lun-yü chieh 論語解

Ma-tsu 馬祖

Mei-chou 梅州

Mei-yang 梅陽

Miao chüeh ming yüan chao fa chieh

妙覺明圓照法界

Miao-hsi 妙喜
Miao-hsi-an 妙喜庵
mieh 滅
ming-hsin chien-hsing 明心見性
Ming-chou 明州
Ming-tao 明道
ming-ting 冥庭
Ming-yüeh-t'ang 明月堂
mo chao 默照
mo-chao Ch'an 默照禪
mo erh ch'ang chao 默而常照
mondo 問答
Mo-tzu 墨子
Nan-an 南安
Nank'ang 南康
Nan-yüan Hui-yung 南院慧顒
nao 鬧
Neng-jen Ssu 能仁寺
ni 逆
nieh-pan-chi-mieh 涅槃寂滅
Nien-p'u 年譜
Ning-kuo hsien 寧國縣
Ou-yang Hsiu 歐陽修
P'ang Yün 龐蘊
Pao-kuang 寶光
Pao-kuo k'ang-min 保國康民

Pao (peak) 寶
Pao-tsang lun 寶藏論
pao-yüan hsieh-shih 報緣謝時
pen 本
pen-chüeh 本覺
Pen-lun 本論
Pi-yen chi 碧巖集
Pi-yen lu 碧巖錄
Pien-cheng-hsieh shuo 辯正邪說
Pien-liang 汴梁
Po-tse sung-ku 百則頌古
pu 不
pu hsin 不信
pu tung tao ch'ang 不動道場
P'u An Chung Wang 普安忠王
P'u-an Yin-su 普庵印肅
P'u-chüeh 普覺
P'u Hsien 普賢
P'u Hui 普慧
P'u-jung P'ing 普融平
P'u-sa Hsing 菩薩行
P'u Shuo 普說
P'u shuo san chieh 普說三界
San-ch'ao pao-hsün 三朝寶訓

san-chiao 三教

san-chiao kuei-i 三教歸一

San-chiao seng-jen li-chiao sui i, erh ch'i Tao t'ung-kuei i-chih
三教聖人立教雖異，
而其道同歸一致

San-ching hsin-i 三經新一

San Lun 三論

se 色

Seng Chao 僧肇

san-chih-shih 善知識

San-t'ang Seng-hsün 山堂僧洵

Shan Yü 善語

Shang-chou 商州

Shang-lao 商老

Sang T'ang 上堂

Shao Yung 邵雍

shen 神

shen pi kung 神臂弓

shen-shih 神識

Sheng-ch'uan lun 聖傳論

shih 實

shih-chüeh 始覺

shih-shih-wu-ai 事事無礙

shih-tai-fu 士大夫

shou 首

shu-chou 舒州

Shun 舜

shun ching-chieh 順境界

Shuo-kua 說卦

Ssu Chou Ta Sheng P'u Chao Ssu
泗州大聖普照寺

Ssu-ma Ch'eng-chen 司馬承禎

Ssu-ma Kuang 司馬光

Ssu-ma Tzu-wei 司馬子微

ssu ping 四病

Su Che 蘇轍

Su Shih 蘇軾

Su Tung-p'o 蘇東坡

Sui 隨

sui-yüan 隨緣

Sung-yüan Ch'ung-yüeh 松源崇岳

Szechwan 四川

Ta-chuan 大傳

Ta-chüeh chin-hsien 大覺金仙

Ta-hsüeh 大學

Ta-hui shu 大慧書

Ta-hui Tsung-kao 大慧宗杲

t'a-ming 塔銘

T'ai-p'ing-chou 太平州

T'ai-chi 太極

T'ai-chi t'u 太極圖

T'ai Hsiang 太象

T'ai-hsüan-ching 太玄經

T'ai-p'ing-chou 太平州

T'ai Tsung 太宗

T'ai Tsu 太祖

T'ang (dynasty) 唐

T'an-hsüan shuo-miao 談玄說妙

t'ang ssu hsing che 堂司行者

T'ang Ssu-t'ui 湯思退

Tao-ch'ien 道謙

Tao-hsin 道心

Tao-hsüeh 道學

Tao-t'ung 道通

Te Ch'ung Fu 德充符

t'eng 藤

ti-pa pu-tung ti 第八不動地

t'i 體

tiao-chu 掉舉

t'ien-chieh 天界

T'ien-ning Ssu 天寧寺

T'ien T'ai 天台

T'ien-t'ung (Hung-chih) 天童

T'ien-t'ung-shan 天童山

ting 定

ting 鼎

to tzai i-pien 墮在一邊

Tou-shuai Ch'iu-chao 兜率求照

tsao-tz'u tien-p'ei 造次顛沛

Ts'ao-hsi 曹谿

Ts'ao-tung 曹洞

Tseng K'ai 曾開

Tseng T'ien 曾恬

tso 作

tso-ch'an 坐禪

Tso yu-i shih 作有義事

tsu k'u chi 卒哭忌

Tsu-yung 祖詠

Tsung-kao 宗杲

Ts'ung-mi 宗密

tu-chüan han 杜撰漢

tu-chüan hsieh chang-lao 杜撰邪長

Tu Shun 杜順

Tung-lin Kuei Ch'an-shih 東林珪禪師

Tung-shan 東山

Tung-shan Hui-yün Yüan Hui-ch'i 東山慧雲院慧齊

Tung-shan shui-shang hsing 東山水上行

Tung-shan Wei 洞山微

Tung Ssu 東寺

T'ung shu 通書
tzu 字
Tzu-chih t'ung-chien 資治通鑑
Tzu-hsüan 子璿
tzu hsin 自信
tzu-jan 自然
Tzu-shuo 字說
Tz'u 慈
Tz'u tuan ta shih yin yüan
此段大事因緣
Ŭich'ŏn 義天
Ummon 雲門
Wang An-shih 王安石
Wang-huai 忘懷
Wang Tsao 汪藻
Wang T'ung 王通
Wang Ying-ch'en 汪應辰
wei na 維那
Wen-chou 温州
Wen Chung-tzu 文中子
Wen Shu 文殊
Wen-ta Ch'an 問答禪
wo 我
wu 無
wu 悟
wu ai 無礙
Wu-ai Hui 無礙會
wu ch'ang 五常
Wu-chi-erh-ta'i-chi
無極而太極
Wu-chin Chu-shih 無盡居士
wu-hsin 悟心
wu-hsing 無形
wu-ko 物格
Wu-ming 悟明
wu shih 無事
Wu-tsu Fa-yen 五祖法演
wu-wei 無為
Wu-yen-tzu Wang 無厭足王
Wu Yüan-chao 吳元昭
yang 陽
yang-ch'i 陽氣
Yang-chou 揚州
Yang Chu 楊朱
Yang Hsiung 楊雄
Yang Ju-nan 楊汝南
yang sheng 養生
Yang Shih 楊時
Yang-tze 揚子江
Yang-yü An 洋嶼庵
Yao 堯
Ye ma 野馬

Yen Chih-t'ui 顏之推

Yen Ta-fang

yin 陰

yin ch'i 陰氣

Yin Tun 尹焞

Ying-an T'an-hua 應安曇華

Ying-chou 郢州

yu shih 有事

yu shih chung shuo san chieh
有十種說三界

Yü Shu 喻樗

Yu Tso 游酢

yüan 願

Yüan 元

yüan-chüeh 圓覺

Yüan-chüeh ching 圓覺經

Yüan-hsing 圓形

Yüan-jen lun 原人論

Yüan Tao lun 原道論

Yüan-wu 圓悟

Yüan-wu K'o-ch'in 圓悟克勤

Yüeh Fei 岳飛

Yün-chu (line) 雲居

Yün-chu-shan 雲居山

Yün-men 雲門

Yün-men An 雲門庵

Yün-men Wen-yen 雲門文偃

Yün-men yü-lu 雲門語錄

Yün-wen 蘊聞

Yün wo chi t'an 雲臥紀談

yung 用

Yung-chia 永嘉

Yung-hsiu 永修

Yung-tao 永道

Bibliography

A. Works attributed to Ta-hui:

1. Yü-lu in 30 chüan:

Ta-hui P'u-chüeh Ch'an-shih yü-lu 大慧普覺禪師語錄

Shukuzōkyō, T'eng 8, pp. 16a-119b.

Ta-hui P'u-chüeh Ch'an-shih yü-lu 大慧普覺禪師語錄

Taishō 47, pp. 811a-943b.

Ta-hui P'u-chüeh Ch'an-shih yü-lu 大慧普覺禪師語錄

(12 chüan) Zokuzōkyō 1, 31, 4

Ta-hui P'u-chueh Ch'an-shih fa-yü 大慧普覺禪師法語

(3 chüan) Zokuzōkyō 1, 31, 6, pp. 510a-32a.

Ta-hui P'u-chüeh Ch'an-shih shu 大慧普覺禪師書

Zokuzōkyō 1, 31, 6, pp. 532b-54b.

Ta-hui P'u-chüeh Ch'an-shih P'u Shuo 大慧普覺禪師普說

(1 chüan version, in two chüan) Zokuzōkyō 1, 31, 5, pp. 489a-509d.

2. Tsung-men wu-k'u 宗門武庫 :

Zokuzōkyō 2, 15, 5, pp. 460c-75b. Hsüeh-t'ang Hsing Ho-shang shih-i lu 雪堂行和尚拾遺錄 appended.

Taishō, vol. 47, pp. 943b-57c.

Shukuzōkyō, T'eng 8, pp. 119b-33a.

3. Tsung tsa tu hai 宗雜毒海 (2 chüan) (also called Ta-hui P'u chüeh Ch'an-shih yü lu 大慧普覺禪師語錄 , 2 chüan) Zokuzōkyō 1, 26, 1, pp. 24a-52a.

4. Ta-hui P'u-chüeh Ch'an-shih P'u Shuo 大慧普覺禪師普說 (4 chüan) Zokuzōkyō 1, 31, 5, pp. 395a-488d.

Ta-hui P'u-chüeh Ch'an-shih P'u Shuo 大慧普覺禪師普說 (in Tōyō Bunko)

5. Cheng-fa-yen-tsang (in 3 chüan, each divided into two parts) 正法眼藏 Zokuzōkyō 2, 23, 1, pp. 1a-78b.

6. Ta-hui Kao Ch'an-shih yü 大慧杲禪師語 in Hsü-k'ai ku-tsun-su yü-yao 續開古尊宿語要, chüan 5, Zokuzōkyō 2, 24, 1, pp. 32b-34c.

7. Lin-an-fu Ching-shan Tsung-kao Ta-hui P'u-chüeh Ch'an-shih yü-yao 臨安府徑山宗杲大慧普覺禪師語要 (2 chüan) in Chih-yüeh lu 指月錄, chüan 31, pp. 2097-363.

B. Sources for Ta-hui's biography:

Ta-hui P'u-chüeh Ch'an-shih nien-p'u 大慧普覺禪師年譜, compiled by Tsu-yung 祖詠. Shukuzōkyō, T'eng 8, pp. 1-16a.

Ta-hui P'u-chüeh Ch'an-shih nien-p'u 大慧普覺禪師年譜 (Sung edition in Rissho University Library, photostatic reproduction).

Tsung-men lien-teng hui-yao 宗門聯灯會要 (1183), chüan 17-18, Zokuzōkyō 2, 9.

Wu-teng hui-yüan 五燈會元, chüan 19, Zokuzōkyō 2, 11, 4, pp. 376b-78d. (1253)

Wu-teng hui-yüan 五燈會元, chüan 20, Zokuzōkyō 2, 11, 4, pp. 394d-403c.

Chia-t'ai p'u-teng lu 嘉泰普燈錄, *chüan* 15, *Zokuzōkyō* 2, 10, 2, pp. 113a-15c. (1204)

Chia-t'ai p'u-teng lu 嘉泰普燈錄, *chüan* 18, *Zokuzōkyō* 2, 10, 2, pp. 130d-37a.

Chia-t'ai p'u-teng lu 嘉泰普燈錄, *chüan* 18, *Zokuzōkyō* 2, 10, 2, pp. 162a-63d.

Chia-t'ai p'u-teng lu 嘉泰普燈錄, *chüan* 23, *Zokuzōkyō* 2, 10, 2, pp. 160b-61a.

Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai 佛祖歷代通載, *chüan* 30, *Zokuzōkyō* 2, 5, 4, pp. 348b-49d. (1341?)

Shih-shih chi-ku lüeh 釋氏稽古略, *chüan* 4, *Zokuzōkyō* 2, 6, 1, pp. 80b-84b.

Ts'ung-lin sheng shih 叢林盛事, *chüan* A, *Zokuzōkyō* 2, 21, 2, pp. 33a-42c.

Chu-shih fen-teng lu 居士分燈錄, *chüan* B, *Zokuzōkyō* 2, 20, 5, pp. 449d-51b; 458a-62c. (1631)

Hang-chou-fu chih 杭州府志 (1784). Compiled by Ch'eng Yün 鄭澐. *Chüan* 107, pp. 20a-b.

Hsüan-ch'eng-hsien chih 宣城縣志 (1888). Compiled by Fan Pao-lien 范葆廉. *Chüan* 18, pp. 10a-11a.

C. Texts in Chinese and Japanese, pre-1900 (by title):

Avataṃsaka sūtra. See *Ta-fang-kuang Fo-hua-yen ching*.

Ch'an-lin pao-hsün 禪林寶訓. Begun by Ta-hui 大慧 and Chu-an 竹庵 Shih-kuei 士珪; completed and revised by Ching-shan 淨善 between 1174-89. *Taishō* 48.

Ch'an-lin pei-yung ch'ing-kuei 禪林備用清規. *Zokuzōkyō* 2, 17, 1.

Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei 禪苑清規. *Zokuzōkyō* 2, 16.

Ch'ien-hsü 潛虛. By Ssu-ma Kuang 司馬光. In *Sung-Yüan hsüeh-an* 宋元學案, *chüan* 8.

Chin kang ching 金剛經. *Taishō* 8.

Chin-shih hsü-pien 金石續編. Ed. by Lu Yao-yü 陸耀遹. Facsimile reproduction. Taipei: Kuo-feng Ch'u-pan-she, 1965.

Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu 景德傳燈錄. Compiled by Tao-yüan 道原. Taipei: Chen-shan-mei ch'u-pan-she, 1967. Also *Taishō* 51.

Chou Kuan hsin-i 周官新義. By Wang An-shih 王安石. Facsimile reproduction. Taipei: Commercial Press, 1975.

Chuang-tzu 莊子. Ssu-pu-pei-yao edition. Taipei: Chung Hwa Book Company, 1973.

Chüeh-i lun hou chi 決疑論後記. By Chang Shang-ying 張商英. *Taishō* 36.

Chung-yung 中庸. See Hsieh Ping-ying, *et al*., eds. *Hsin-i ssu-shu tu-pen*.

Daie sho koro ju 大慧書栲栳珠 By Muchaku Dōchū 無著道忠. Handwritten copy, no date.

Diamond sūtra. See *Chin kang ching*.

Erh-Ch'eng ch'uan-shu 二程全書. Ed. by K'ang Shao-tsung 康紹宗. Ssu-pu-pei-yao edition.

Fan-wang ching 梵網經. *Taishō* 24.

Fo-hai Hui-yüan Ch'an-shih kuang-lu 佛海慧遠禪師廣錄. Zokuzōkyō 2, 25, 5.

Fo-kuo Yüan-wu Ch'an-shih pi-yen lu 佛果圜悟禪師碧巖錄. Taishō 48.

Fo-shuo Wei-mo chieh ching 佛說維摩詰經. Taishō 14.

Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai 佛祖歷代通載. Compiled by Mei-wu Nien-ch'ang 梅屋念常. Taishō 49; also Zokuzōkyō 2, 5.

Fo-tsu t'ung-chi 佛祖統紀. Taishō 49; also Zokuzōkyō 2, 5.

Fo-yen Ch'an-shih yü-lu 佛眼禪師語錄. In Ku-tsun-su yü-lu 古尊宿語錄. Zokuzōkyō 2, 23, 4.

Gaṇḍavyūha. See Ju-fa-chieh p'in.

Heng-p'u chi 橫浦集. By Chang Chiu-ch'eng 張九成. Ssu-k'u ch'uan-shu edition. Taipei: Commercial Press, 1973.

Honan Ch'eng-shih i-shu 河南程氏遺書. Ed. by Chu Hsi 朱熹. Kuo-hsüeh chi-pen ts'ung-shu edition. Shanghai: Shang-wu Yin-shu-kuan, 1935.

Honan Ch'eng-shih i-shu 河南程氏遺書. Ed. by Chu Hsi 朱熹. Ssu-pu-pei-yao edition.

Hsü ch'uan-teng lu 続伝灯録. Compiled by Yüan-chi Chü-ting 円極居頂. Taishō 51.

Chih-yüeh lu 指月錄. Compiled by Hsü Ju-chi 瞿汝稷. Taipei: Chen-shan-mei Ch'u-pan she, 1959.

Hsü-k'ai ku-tsun-su yü-yao 続開古尊宿語要. Ed. by Hui-shih Shih-ming 晦室師明. Zokuzōkyō 2, 23, 4.

Hsü-t'ang Chih-yü Ho-shang yü-lu 虛堂智愚和尚語錄. Zokuzōkyō 2, 26.

Hsüeh-t'ang Hsing Ho-shang yü 雪堂行和尚語 , In *Hsü-k'ai ku-tsun-su yü-yao*. *Zokuzōkyō* 2, 35, 5.

Hsün-chin wen-chi 鐔津文集 . By Ch'i-sung 契嵩 . *Taishō* 52.

Hu-fa lun 護法論. By Chang Shang-ying 張商英 . *Taishō* 52.

Hua-yen chüeh-i lun 華嚴決疑論. By Li T'ung-hsüan 李通玄 . *Taishō* 36.

Hua-yen fa-chieh kuan 華嚴法界觀. Attributed to Tu Shun 杜順. *Taishō* 45.

Hua-yen shui-shu yen-i ch'ao 華嚴隨疏演義鈔 . By Ch'eng-kuan 澄觀 . *Taishō* 36.

Hung-chih Ch'an-shih kuang-lu 宏智禪師廣錄 . *Taishō* 48.

I-ching. See T'ao Tsung-han, ed., *I-ching chi-chu*.

I-ch'uan wen-chi 伊川文集 . Ed. by Ch'eng Tuan-chung 程端中 . In *Erh-Ch'eng ch'uan-shu*. Ssu-pu-pei-yao edition.

Ju-fa-chieh p'in 入法界品. *Taishō* 10.

Ku-tsun-su yü-lu 古尊宿語錄 . *Zokuzōkyō* 2, 23.

Ku-tsun-su yü-yao 古尊宿語要 . *Zokuzōkyō* 2, 23.

Kuang-hung-ming chi 廣弘明集 . Compiled by Tao-hsüan 道宣 .

Kuang yüan-chiao p'ien 廣原教篇 . By Ch'i-sung 契嵩 . In *Hsün-chin wen-chi*.

Lao-tzu 老子 . Ssu-pu-pei-yao edition. Taipei: Chung Hwa Book Company, 1970.

Lin-chi lu 臨濟錄. See Yanagida Seizan, ed. *Rinzai roku*.

Lun-yü 論語 . See Hsieh Ping-ying, *et al*., eds. *Hsin-i ssu-shu tu-pen*.

Meng-tzu (Mencius) 孟子. See Hsieh Ping-ying, et al., eds. Hsin-i ssu-shu tu-pen.

Pan-jo po-lo-mi-to hsin ching 般若波羅蜜多心經. Taishō 8.

P'ang Chu-shih yü-lu 龐居士語錄. See Iriya Yoshitaka, ed., Hōkoshi goroku.

Pao-tsang lun 寶藏論. Attributed to Seng Chao 僧肇. Zokuzōkyō 2, 1, 1.

Pen lun 本論. By Ou-yang Hsiu 歐陽修.

Pi-yen lu 碧巖錄. See Fo-kuo Yüan-wu Ch'an-shih pi-yen lu.

Pi-yen lu Hsi-ling hou-hsü 碧巖錄希陵後序. By Hsi-ling 希陵. Taishō 48.

Prajñāpāramita-hṛdaya sūtra. See Pan-jo po-lo-mi-to hsin ching.

P'u-an Yin-su Ch'an-shih yü-lu 普庵印肅禪師語錄. Zokuzōkyō 2, 25, 3.

Shan-t'ang Hsun Ch'an-shih yü 山堂洵禪師語. In Hsü-k'ai ku-tsun-su yü-yao. Zokuzōkyō 2, 25, 5.

Sheng ch'uan lun 聖傳論. By Liu Tzu-hui 劉子翬. In Sung-Yüan hsüeh-an p'u-i, chüan 43.

Shih-shih yao-lan 釋氏要覽. Compiled by Tao-ch'eng 道誠. Taishō 54.

Shuo-kua 說卦. See T'ao Tsung-han, ed. I-ching chi-chu.

Sung kao-seng chuan 宋高僧傳. Taisho 50.

Sung-yüan Yüeh Ch'an-shih yu 松源岳禪師語. In Hsu-k'ai ku-tsun-su yü-yao. Zokuzōkyō 2, 23, 5.

Ta-chuan 大傳. See T'ao Tsung-han, ed. I-ching chi-chu.

Ta-fang-kuang Fo-hua-yen ching 大方廣佛華嚴經 . Taishō 10.

Ta-fang-kuang yüan-chueh ching lüeh ch'ao 大方廣圓覺經略鈔. By Ts'ung-mi 宗密. Zokuzōkyō 1, 15, 2.

Ta-fang-kuang yüan-chüeh ching lüeh-shu-ch'ao 大方廣圓覺經略疏鈔. By Ts'ung-mi 宗密 . Zokuzōkyō 1, 15, 1.

Ta-fang-kuang yüan-chüeh ching ta-shu 大方廣圓覺經大疏 . By Ts'ung-mi 宗密. Zokuzōkyō 1, 14, 2.

Ta-fang-kuang yüan-chüeh ching ta-shu shih-i ch'ao 大方廣圓覺經大疏釋義鈔 . By Ts'ung-mi 宗密 . Zokuzōkyō 1, 14, 4.

Ta-fang-kuang yüan-chüeh hsiu to lo liao i ching hsü 大方廣圓覺脩多羅了義經序 . By Ts'ung-mi 宗密. Zokuzōkyō 1, 15, 1.

Ta-hui fa-yüan wen (Daie hatsugen bun) 大慧發願文. In Daikaku Zenji Zazen ron 大覺禪師坐禪論 . Kokuyaku Zengaku taisei 國譯禪學大成, XII. Tokyo: Futamatsu Shoten, 1930.

Ta-hui P'u-chüeh Ch'an-shih Nien-p'u 大慧普覺禪師年譜. By Tsu-yung 祖詠. Shukusatsu zōkyō, T'eng 8.

Ta-hui P'u-chüeh Ch'an-shih Nien-p'u 大慧普覺禪師年譜 . By Tsu-yung 祖詠. Photostatic reproduction of Sung copy.

Ta-hsüeh 大學. See Hsieh Ping-ying, et al., eds. Hsin-i ssu-shu tu-pen.

Ti-tsang P'u-sa pen yüan ching 地藏菩薩本願經. Taishō 53.

T'ien-t'ung Ju-ching Ch'an-shih yü-lu 天童如淨禪師語錄. Zukuzōkyō 2, 29, 5; also Taishō 48.

Ts'ung-lin chiao-ting ch'ing kuei tsung-yao 叢林較定清規總要. Zokuzōkyō 2, 17, 1.

Tung-lin Ho-shang Yün-men-an chu sung ku 東林和尚雲門庵主頌古. By Ta-hui Tsung-kao 大慧宗杲 and Chu-an Shih-kuei 竹庵士珪. In Ku-tsun-su yü-lu, chüan 47.

Tung-shan Hui-k'ung Ch'an-shih yü-lu 東山慧空禪師語錄. Ed. by Hui-pi 慧弼. Zokuzōkyō 2, 25, 2.

Tzu-chih t'ung-ch'ien 資治通鑑. By Ssu-ma Kuang 司馬光. Facsmile reproduction of 1876 edition. Taipei: Kuang-wen Shu-chü, 1967.

Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa. See Fo-shuo Wei-mo chieh ching.

Wu-teng hüi-yuan 五燈會元. Ed. by Hui-ming 慧明. Zokuzōkyō 2, 10 and 2, 11.

Ying-an T'an-hua yü-lu 應安曇華語錄. Zokuzōkyō 2, 25, 3.

Yüan chüeh ching lüeh-shu-ch'ao 圓覺經略疏鈔. See Ta-fang-kuang yüan-chüeh ching lüeh-shu-ch'ao.

Yüan-chüeh ching ta-shu-ch'ao 圓覺經大疏鈔. See Ta-fang-kuang yüan-chüeh ching ta-shu shih-i ch'ao.

Yüan-jen lun 原人論. By Ts'ung-mi 宗密. Taishō 45.

Yüan-tao lun 原道論. By Hsiao Tsung 孝宗. In Fo-tsu t'ung-chi, chüan 47, Taishō 49; also in Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai, chüan 47, Taishō 49.

Yüan-wu Fo-kuo Ch'an-shih yü-lu 圜悟佛果禪師語錄. Taishō 47.

Zenrin shōkisen 禪林象器箋. By Muchaku Dōchū 無著道忠. Completed in 1716. Tokyo: Seishin Shobo, 1963.

D. Texts in Chinese and Japanese, pre-1900, in modern editions (by editor):

Araki Kengo 荒木見悟. Daie sho 大慧書. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1969.

Asahina Sōgen 朝比奈宗源, ed. and trans. Hekigan roku [Pi-yen lu] 碧巖錄. 3 vols. Rev. ed. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1971.

Hsieh Ping-ying 謝冰瑩, Liu Cheng-hao 劉正浩, Li 李鍌, and Ch'iu Hsieh-yu 邱燮友, eds., Hsin-i ssu-shu tu-pen 新譯四書讀本. Taipei: San-min Shu-chü, 1966.

Iriya Yoshitaka, ed. and trans. Hōkoshi goroku 龐居士語錄. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1973.

Kagamishima Genryū 鏡島元隆, Satō Tatsugen 佐藤達玄 and Kosaka Kiyū 小坂機融, ed. and trans. Yaku-chu Zen-en shin-gi 訳註禪苑清規. Tokyo: Sōtō Shū Shūmu-chō, 1972.

Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄. Genjinron 原人論. Tokyo: Meidoku Shuppansha, 1974.

Nishitani Keiji 西谷啓治 and Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, eds. Zenke goroku 禪家語錄. 2 vols. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1972 and 1974.

T'ao Tsung-han 陶宗翰, ed. I-ching chi-chu 易經集註. Taipei: Hsin-lu Shu-chü, 1968.

Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山 Rinzai roku [Lin-chi lu] 臨濟錄. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppansha, 1972.

E. Works in Chinese and Japanese, Post-1900.

Abe Jōichi 阿部肇一. "Nan Sō no Daie Sōkō" 南宋の大慧宗杲. *Komazawa Daigaku Bungakubu kenkyū kiyō* 駒澤大学文学部研究紀要, XXIV (March, 1966), pp. 9-25.

Abe Jōichi. *Chūgoku Zenshū shi no kenkyū* 中国禅宗史の研究. Tokyo: Seishin Shobo, 1963.

Abe Jōichi. "Sōdai Ōryō-ha no hatten" 宋代黄竜派の発展. *Komazawa shigaku* 駒澤史學, CI (Jan. 1962), pp. 32-39.

Abe Masao 阿部正雄. "Gendai ni okeru shin no mondai: Bukkyō-teki shin to risei" 現代における信の問題；仏教的信と理性. *Bukkyō ni okeru shin no mondai* 仏教における信の問題. Edited by Nihon Bukkyō Gakkai 日本仏教学会. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1963.

Andō Gikan 安藤義鑑. "Shūmitsu Zenji no Zenkyō-ichi ron ni tsuite" 宗密禅師の禅教一致論に就て. *Zengaku kenkyū* 禪學研究 XI (Dec., 1929), pp. 67-82 and XII (March, 1930), pp. 93-115.

Andō Tomonobu 安藤智信. "Sō no Chō Sho-ei ni tsuite" 宋の張商英について. *Tōhōgaku* 東方學, XXII (July, 1961), pp. 57-66.

Andō Tomonobu. "Chō Sho-ei no *Gohōron* to sono haikei" 張商英の護法論とその背景. *Ōtani gakuhō* 大谷學報, XLII, No. 3 (Jan., 1963), pp. 29-40.

Araki Kengo 荒木見悟. *Bukkyō to Jukyō* 仏教と儒教. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1962.

Araki Kengo, trans. Daie sho 大慧書. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1969.

Araki Kengo. "Shi to sankyō: Zen" 士と三教:禪. Shūkyō 宗教. Chūgoku bunka sōsho 中国文化叢書, VI. Edited by Kubo Noritada 窪德忠 and Nishi Junzō 西順藏. Tokyo: Daishūkan Shoten, 1967.

Araki Kengo. "Sodai no Jukyō to Bukkyō" 宋代の儒教と佛教. Rekishi kyōiku 歴史教育, XVII, No. 3 (July, 1969), pp. 36-42.

Araki Kengo. "Zensha e no teigen" 禪者への提言. Zen bunka 禪文化, No. 49 (June, 1968), pp. 48-55.

Chang Yü-huan 張馭寰. "Kuan-yü wo-kuo 'Ah-yu-wang t'a' ti hsing-hsiang yü fa-chan" 关于我国"阿育王塔"的形象与发展. Xiandai Foxue 現代佛学 [Hsien-tai Fo-hsüeh], 1964, No. 4 (August), pp. 33-37.

Chikusa Masaaki 竺沙雅章. "Sōdai Fukken no shakai to jiin" 宋代福建の社会と寺院. Tōyōshi kenkyū 東洋史研究, XV, No. 2.

Chin Yü-fu 金毓黻. "Sung-tai kuan-chih yü hsing-cheng chih-tu" 宋代官制與行政制度. Wen-shih tsa-chih 文史雜誌, II, No. 4 (April, 1942), pp. ?

Harada Kōdō 原田弘道. "Kōan Zen no seiritsu ni tsuite" 公案禅の成立について. Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyo Gakubu kenkyū kiyō 駒澤大學佛教學部研究紀要, XXX (March, 1972), pp. 57-84.

Harada Kōdō. "Sō cho Zen to Dōgen Zenji no tachiba" 宋朝禅と道元禪師の立場. Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyo Gakubu kenkyū kiyō, XXXI (March, 1973), pp. 239-57.

Ichikawa Hakugen 市川白弦. Daie 大慧. Tokyo: Kōbundō Shobo, 1941.

Imaeda Aishin 今枝愛真. Chūsei Zenshi no kenkyū 中世禪史の研究. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1970.

Imai Usaburō 今井宇三郎. "Sōdai no Bukkyō shisō" 宋代の仏教思想. Rekishi kyōiku, VII, No. 6 (June, 1960), pp. 9-14.

Ishii Kyōdō 石井 . Kegon kyōgaku seiritsu shi 華嚴教學成立史. Tokyo: Chūō Koron Jigyō Shuppan, 1964.

Ishii Shūdō 石井修道. "Daie goroku no kisoteki kenkyū (jo)" 大慧語錄の基礎的研究(上). Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyō Gakubu kenkyū kiyō, XXXI (March, 1973), pp. 283-306.

Ishii Shūdō. "Daie goroku no kisoteki kenkyū (chū)" 大慧語錄の基礎的研究(中). Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyō Gakubu kenkyū kiyō, XXXII (March, 1974), pp. 215-62.

Ishii Shūdō. "Daie goroku no kisoteki kenkyū (ge)" 大慧語錄の基礎的研究(下). Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyo Gakubu kenkyū kiyō, XXXIII (March, 1975), pp. 151-71.

Ishii Shūdō. "Daie Sōkō to sono deshi-tachi (ichi)" 大慧宗杲とその弟子たち(一). Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū 印度學佛教學研究 (Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies), XVIII, No. 2 (March, 1970), pp. 332-34.

Ishii Shūdō. Daie Sōkō to sono deshi-tachi (ni)" 大慧宗杲とその弟子たち(二). Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū, XIX, No. 2 (March, 1971), pp. 322-324.

Ishii Shūdō. "Daie Sōkō to sono deshi-tachi (san)" 大慧宗杲とその弟子たち（三）. Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū, XX, No. 2 (March, 1972), pp. 275-77.

Ishii Shūdō. "Daie Sōkō to sono deshi-tachi (shi)" 大慧宗杲とその弟子たち（四）. Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū, XXI, No. 2 (March, 1973), pp. 389-91.

Ishii Shūdō. "Daie Sōkō to sono deshi-tachi (go) 大慧宗杲とその弟子たち（五）. Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū, XXII, No. 1 (Dec., 1973), pp. 391-95.

Ishii Shūdō. "Daie Sōkō to sono deshi-tachi (roku) 大慧宗杲とその弟子たち（六）. Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū, XXIII, No. 1 (Dec., 1974), pp. 336-39.

Ishii Shūdō. "Daie Sōkō to sono deshi-tachi (nana)" 大慧宗杲とその弟子たち（七）. Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū XXIV, No. 2 (March, 1976), pp. 268-71.

Ishii Shūdō. "Daie Sōkō to sono deshi-tachi (hachi)" 大慧宗杲とその弟子たち（八）. Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū, XXV, No. 2 (March, 1977), pp. 257-61.

Jimbo Nyoten 神保如天 and Andō Bunei 安藤文英. Zengaku jiten 禪學辭典. Tokyo: Muga Sanbo, 1927.

Jimbo Nyoten and Andō Bunei. Zengaku jiten, revised edition. Tokyo: Chūsan Shobo, 1958.

Kagamishima Genryū 鏡島元隆. Dōgen Zenji no inyō kyōten, goroku no kenkyū 道元禪師の引用經典，語録の研究. Tokyo: Mokujisha, 1965.

Kagamishima Genryū 鏡島元隆, Satō Tatsugen 佐藤達玄 and Kosaka Kiyū 小坂機融. *Yaku-chū Zen-en shin-gi* 訳註禅苑清規 [*Translated and Annotated Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei*]. Tokyo: Sōtō Shū Shūmu-chō, 1972.

Kajiya Sonin 梶谷宗忍. "Daie" 大慧. *Zen no rekishi--Chūgoku* 禅の歴史—中國. *Kōza Zen* 講座禅, III. Edited by Nishitani Keiji 西谷啓治. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1967.

Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄. *Genjinron* 原人論. Tokyo: Meitoku Shuppansha, 1974.

Kamata Shigeo. *Chūgoku Kegon shisōshi no kenkyū* 中國華嚴思想史の研究. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Tōyōbunka Kenkyūjo, 1965.

Kamata Shigeo. *Shūmitsu kyōgaku no shisōshiteki kenkyū* 宗密教學の思想史的研究. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1975.

Kamata Shigeo. "Sui Tō jidai ni okeru Ju Butsu Dō sankyō" 隋唐時代における儒仏道三教. *Rekishi kyōiku* 歴史教育, XVII, No. 3 (July, 1969), pp. 22-27.

Kanai Tokuyuki 金井徳幸. "Sōdai no Bukkyō ni tsuite" 宋代の仏教について. *Rekishi kyōiku*, X, No. 8 (Aug. 1962), pp. 52-58.

Kaneoka Hidetomo 金岡秀友. "Mikkyō ni okeru shin kōsō no tokushoku to sono henka" 密教における信構造の特色とその変化. *Bukkyo ni okeru shin no mondai* 仏教における信の問題. Edited by Nihon Bukkyō Gakkai 日本仏教學会. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1963.

Katō Shigeru 加藤繁. Shina keizaishi kōshō 支那經濟史考證. 2 vols. Tokyo: Toyo Bunko, 1953.

Kawada Kumatarō 川田熊太郎. "Buddha Kegon (Wreath of Buddha)." Kawada Kumatarō and Nakamura Hajime 中村元, eds. Kegon shisō 華嚴思想. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1960.

Kawada Kumatarō and Nakamura Hajime, eds. Kegon shisō 華嚴思想. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1960.

Kobayashi Ensho 小林圓照. "Keiho Shumitsu no 'chi' no shisō ni tsuite" 圭峯宗密の「知」の思想について. Zengaku kenkyū, XLIX (Feb., 1959), pp. 110-27.

Komazawa Daigaku Toshokan 駒澤大學圖書館. Zenseki mokuroku 禪籍目錄. Komazawa Daigaku, 1928.

Kosaka Giyū 小坂機融. "Nan Sō Zenrin no dōkō ni tsuite" 南宋禪林の動向について. Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū, XVIII, No. 2 (March, 1970), pp. 335-38.

Huang Ch'an-hua 黄懺华. "K'an-hua Ch'an yü Mo-chao Ch'an" 看話禪与默照禪. Hsien-tai Fo-chiao 現代仏教, No. 5, 1958.

Kubo Noritada 窪德忠. "Shin Dōkyō" 新道教. Shūkyō 宗教. Chūgoku bunka sōsho 中國文化叢書, VI. Edited by Kubo Noritada and Nishi Junzō 西順藏. Tokyo: Daishūkan Shoten, 1967.

Kubota Ryōon 久保田量遠. Shina Ju Dō Butsu kōshō shi 支那儒道佛交涉史. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha, 1943.

Kubota Ryōon. Shina Ju Dō Butsu sankyō shiron 支那儒道佛三教史論. Tokyo: Tōhō Shoin, 1931.

Kusamoto Fumio 久須本文雄. Renkei shisō ni okeru Zen-teki na mono 濂渓思想に於ける禅的なもの. Zengaku kenkyū, LIII (July, 1963), pp. 82-101.

Kusamoto Fumio. "Shushi gaku Zen kō" 朱子學禅考. Zengaku kenkyū, LIV (July, 1964), pp. 116-37.

Kusamoto Fumio. "Tei Meitō no ningen keisei kan to Zen" 程明道の人間形成観と禅. Zengaku kenkyū, LV (Feb., 1966), pp. 98-108.

Makita Tairyō 牧田諦亮. Chūgoku kinsei Bukkyōshi kenkyū 中国近世佛教史研究. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1957.

Matsunami Seiren 松濤誠廉. "Bukkyō ni okeru shin no chii" 仏教における信の地位. Bukkyō ni okeru shin no mondai. Edited by Nihon Bukkyō Gakkai. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1963.

Matsuura Shuko 松浦秀光. Zenke no sōhō to tsuizenkuyō no kenkyū 禅家の葬法と追善供養の研究. Tokyo: Sankiho Busshorin, 1970.

Michibata Ryōshū 道端良秀. Chūgoku Bukkyōshi 中国仏教史. Revised edition. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1972.

Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨. Bukkyō daijiten 佛教大辞典. 10 vols. 3rd ed. Tokyo: Seikai Shoten Kangyō Kyokai, 1960.

Miyakawa Shoshi 宮川尚志. "Sō no Kisō to Dōkyō 宋の徽宗と道教." Tōkai Daigaku Bungakubu kiyō 東海大學紀要文学部. No. 23 (1975), pp. 1-9.

Miyazaki Ichisada 宮崎市定. "Sōdai no daigakusei seikatsu" 宋代の太學生生活. Shirin 史林, XVI, No. 1 (Jan., 1931), pp. 97-105 and No. 4 (Oct., 1931), pp. 92-115.

Miyazaki Ichisada. "Sōdai no shifū 宋代の士風." Shigaku zasshi 史學雜誌, LVII (1953), pp. 139-69.

Nakamura Hajime 中村元. "Kegonkyō no shisōshiteki igi" 華嚴經の思想的意義 ("The Significance of the Buddhāvataṃsaka in the World History of Ideas"). Kegon shisō 華嚴思想. Edited by Kawada Kumatarō and Nakamura Hajime. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1960.

Nakamura Hajime, Kasahara Kazuo 笠原一男, and Kaneoka Hidetomo 金岡秀友. Minshu no Bukkyō 民衆の仏教. Ajia Bukkyō shi: Chūgoku hen アジア仏教史：中國編, II. Tokyo: Kōsei Shuppansha, 1976.

Ogawa Kan'ichi 小川貫弌. "Sōdai jiin no tokushitsu" 宋代寺院の特質. Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū, XVII, No. 1 (Dec., 1968), pp. 60-66.

Ogawa Kōkan 小川弘貫. "Daie, Wanchi ni miraruru Nyoraizō, Busshō" 大慧, 宏智にみらるる如來藏, 仏性. Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyo Gakubu kenkyū kiyō, XXX (March, 1972), pp. 47-56.

Ogisu Jundō 荻須純道. "Chō Sō Bukkyō fukkō no ichi kōsatsu" 趙宋佛教復興の一考察 ("An Examination of the Revival of Buddhism in the Chao Sung Dynasty"). Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū, VI, No. 1 (Jan., 1958), pp. 221-24.

Ogisu Jundō. "Daie" 大慧. Zen bunka 禪文化, No. 45 (June 1967), pp.

Ogisu Jundō. "Gohō no Zensha Butsu-nichi Kai-sū" 護法の禪者仏日契嵩. Zen bunka, No. 41 (June, 1966), pp. 74-80.

Ogisu Jundō. "Daie Zenji no Hekiganshu shoki ni tsuite" 大慧禅師の碧巖集焼毀について. Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū, XI, No. 1 (Jan., 1963), pp. 115-18.

Ogisu Jundō. Nihon chūsei Zenshū shi 日本中世禪宗史. Tokyo: Mokujisha, 1965.

Rikukawa Taiun 陸川堆雲. "Dōgen Zenji no Daie Zenji hihan ni tsuite" 道元禅師の大慧禅師批判について. Zengaku kenkyū, LV (Feb., 1966), pp. 56-70.

Saeki Tomi 佐伯富 and Chikusa Masaaki 竺沙雅章, eds. Sō no shin bunka 宋の新文化. Tōyō no rekishi 東洋の歴史, VI. Tokyo: Jinbutsu Oraisha, 1977.

Sakai Tokugen 酒井得元. "Sōtō Zen no tokushoku" 曹洞禅の特色. Deai 出会い, IV, No. 1 (May, 1972), pp. 20-41.

Sekiguchi Shindai 關口真大. "Kōan Zen to Mokushō Zen" 公案禅と默照禅. Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū, XVI, No. 2 (March, 1968), pp. 114-121.

Sekiguchi Shindai. "Rinzai Zen to Sōtō Zen" 臨濟禅と曹洞禅. Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū, XIV, No. 2 (March, 1965), pp. 122-27.

Sogabe Shizuo 曽我部静雄. "Sōdai Fukushū no Bukkyō" 宋代福州の佛教. Tsukamoto Hakase shoju ki'nen Bukkyōshigaku ronshu 塚本博士頌壽記念佛教史學論集. Kyoto: Tsukamoto Hakase Shoju Ki'nenkai, 1961.

√ Sōshi Teiyō Hensen Kyōryoku Iinkai 宋史提要編纂協力委員会. (Japan Committee for the Sung Project), Sōdaishi nempyō (Nan Sō) 宋代史年表(南宋). (A Chronological Table of the Sung Dynasty, Southern Sung [1127-1279]). Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko, 1974.

√ Suzuki Tetsuo 鈴木哲雄. "Senshū ni okeru Zenshū" 泉州における禅宗. Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū, XXIV, No. 1 (Dec., 1975), pp. 109-13.

√ Tokiwa Daijō 常盤大定. Shina ni okeru Bukkyō to Jukyō Dōkyō 支那に於ける佛教と儒教道教. Tokyo: Tōyō bunko ronsō 13, 1930.

Tsukamoto Zenryū 塚本善隆. Jōron kenkyū 肇論研究. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1955.

Ui Hakuju 宇井伯壽. Dai san Zenshūshi kenkyū 第三禅宗史研究. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1943.

Wakayama Chōkan 若山超関. "Dōgen Zenji no shinkō-kan" 道元禅師の信仰観. Bukkyo ni okeru shin no mondai 仏教における信の問題. Edited by Nihon Bukkyo Gakkai. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1963.

Yamada Ryōken 山田亮賢. "Kegon kyōgaku ni okeru shin no ichi" 華厳教学における信の位置. Bukkyō ni okeru shin no mondai. Edited by Nihon Bukkyō Gakkai. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1963.

Yamazaki Hiroshi 山崎宏. "Keihō Shūmitsu ni tsuite" 圭峯宗密について. Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū, XV, No. 2 (March, 1967), pp. 16-21.

Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山. "Chūgoku Zenshū shi" 中國禪宗史. *Zen no rekishi--Chūgoku* 禅の歴史－中國. *Kōza Zen* 講座禅, II. Edited by Nishitani Keiji 西谷啓治. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1967.

Yanagida Seizan. "Daizōkyō to Zenroku no nyuzō" 大藏経と禅録の入藏. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, XX, No. 1 (Dec., 1971), pp. 76-83.

Yanagida Seizan. "Kanwa Zen ni okeru shin to gi no mondai" 看話禅における信と疑の問題. *Bukkyō ni okeru shin no mondai*. Edited by Nihon Bukkyō Gakkai. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1963.

Yanagida Seizan. "Zenseki kaidai" 禅籍解題. *Zenke goroku* 禅家語録. 2 vols. Edited by Yanagida Seizan and Nishitani Keiji. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1974.

Yanagida Seizan. "Zenshū goroku no keisei" 禅宗語録の形成. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, XVIII, No. 1 (Dec., 1969), pp. 39-47.

Yao Ming-ta 姚名達. *Ch'eng I-ch'uan nien-p'u* 程伊川年譜. Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1937.

Yokoyama Hidesuke 横山秀哉. *Zen no kenchiku* 禅の建築. Tokyo: Keikokusha, 1967.

Yoshioka Yoshitoyo. 吉岡義豊. "*Sankyō shiki* no seiritsu ni tsuite" 三教指帰の成立について. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, VIII, No. 1 (Jan., 1960), pp. 114-18.

F. Works in Western Languages

Balazs, Etienne. Chinese Civilization and Bureaucracy: Variations on a Theme. Trans. by H. M. Wright. Ed. by Arthur Wright. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1964.

Bush, Susan Hilles. "The Chinese Literati on Painting: Su Shih (1037-1101) to Tung Ch'i-ch'ang (1555-1638)." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1968.

Carter, Thomas Francis. The Invention of Printing in China. 2nd ed. rev. by L. Carrington Goodrich. New York: The Ronald Press, Co., 1955.

Chan, Wing-tsit. A Source Book in Chinese Philosophy. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Chan, Wing-tsit. The Way of Lao Tzu. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1963.

Chang, Carsun. The Development of Neo-Confucian Thought, I. New York: Bookman Associates, 1957.

Chang Chung-yuan. Original Teachings of Ch'an Buddhism. 2nd Vintage Books ed.; New York: Random House, 1971.

Chang Fu-jui. Les Fonctionnaires des Song. Paris and the Hague: Mouton and Co., 1962.

Chang, Garma C. C. The Practice of Zen. New York: Harper and Row, 1959.

Ch'en, Kenneth. Buddhism in China. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964.

Ch'en, Kenneth. The Chinese Transformation of Buddhism. Princeton: Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973.

Chiang Fu-tsung. "A City of Cathay" (Ch'ing-ming Shang-ho t'u 清明上河圖). Monumenta Serica, 1971.

Chow Yih-ching. La Philosophie Morale dans le Neo-Confucianisme. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1954.

Chu Hsi and Lü Tsu-ch'ien, eds. Reflections on Things at Hand. Translated by Wing-tsit Chan. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.

Ch'ü T'ung-tsu. "Chinese Class Structure and its Ideology." Chinese Thought and Institutions. Edited by J. K. Fairbank. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Conze, Edward. Buddhist Wisdom Books. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1958.

Cook, Francis. Hua Yen Buddhism: The Jewel Net of Indra. University Park, Penn.: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1977.

de Bary, William Theodore, ed. The Buddhist Tradition in India, China and Japan. New York: Random House, Vintage Books edition, 1972.

de Bary, William Theodore. "A Reappraisal of Neo-Confucianism." Studies in Chinese Thought. Edited by Arthur F. Wright. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Dumoulin, Heinrich. A History of Zen Buddhism. New York: Pantheon Books, 1963.

Dutt, Nalinaksha. Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism. London, 1930.

Eberhard, Wolfram. Guilt and Sin in Traditional China. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

Eberhard, Wolfram. A History of China. 3rd ed.; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.

Edgerton, Franklin. "Dominant Ideas in the Formation of Indian Culture." Journal of the American Oriental Society, LXII (1942), pp. 151-56.

Fairbank, J. K., ed. Chinese Thought and Institutions. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Fontein, Jan. The Pilgrimage of Sudhana. The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1967.

Franke, Herbert, ed. Sung Biographies. 3 vols. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1976.

Freeman, Michael Dennis. "Loyang and the Opposition to Wang An-shih: The Rise of Confucian Conservatism, 1068-1086." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1973.

Fung Yu-lan. History of Chinese Philosophy. 2 vols. Second edition in English. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952.

Gernet, Jacques. Daily Life in China on the Eve of the Mongol Invasion. Trans. by H. M. Wright. New York: The Macmillian Co., 1962.

Graham, A. C. Two Chinese Philosophers. London: Lund Humphries, 1958.

Greenblatt, Kristin Yü (Yü Chün-fang). "Ta-hui Tsung-kao and Kung-an Ch'an." Unpublished paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Asian Studies, Toronto, 1976.

Haeger, John W. Crisis and Prosperity in Sung China. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1975.

Hakeda, Yoshito S. The Awakening of Faith. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.

Hurvitz, Leon, trans. Scripture of the Lotus Blossom of the Fine Dharma. New York: Columbia University Press, 1976.

Inazu, Kizow. "Final Stage of Religious Awakenment Expressed in the Seventh and Eighth Grade of Bodhisattva." Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū (Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies) XVIII, No. 2 (March, 1970), pp. 1043-54.

Isshū Miura and Sasaki, Ruth Fuller. Zen Dust. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966.

Jan Yün-hua. "Ch'i-sung." Sung Biographies. Vol. I. Edited by Herbert Franke. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1976.

Jonker, D. R. "Lü Pen-chung." Sung Biographies. Vol. II. Edited by Herbert Franke. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1976.

Kaplan, Edward Harold. "Yueh Fei and the Founding of the Southern Sung." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1970.

Keel, Hee Sung. "Chinul, the Founder of the Korean Son (Zen) Tradition." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1977.

King, Winston L. In the Hope of Nibbana. LaSalle, Ill.: Open Court Publishing Company, 1964.

Kracke, Edward A., Jr. Civil Service in Early Sung China, 960-1067. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953.

Kracke, Edward A., Jr. "Family vs. Merit in Chinese Civil Service Examinations Under the Empire." Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, X (1947), pp. 103-23.

Kracke, Edward A., Jr. "Region, Family and Individual in the Chinese Examination System. Chinese Thought and Institutions. Edited by J. K. Fairbank. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957, pp. 251-68.

Kracke, Edward A., Jr. "Sung Society: Change within Tradition." Far Eastern Quarterly, XIV (1955), pp. 479-88.

Kracke, Edward A., Jr. Translations of Sung Civil Service Titles. Paris, 1957.

Legge, James. Confucius: Confucian Analects, The Great Learning and the Doctrine of the Mean. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1971. Reprint of the 2nd revised edition published by Clarendon Press, Oxford, as Vol. I of The Chinese Classics, 1893.

Legge, James. The Works of Mencius. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1971. Reprint of the 2nd revised edition published by Clarendon Press, Oxford, as Vol. II of The Chinese Classics, 1895.

Li Chi. Formation of the Chinese People. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1928.

Liebenthal, W., trans. The Book of Chao. Monumenta Serica Monograph XIII. Peiping: The Catholic University of Peking, 1948.

Liu, James T. C. and Golas, Peter. Change in Sung China. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Co., 1969.

Liu, James T. C. "An Early Sung Reformer: Fan Chung-yen." Chinese Thought and Institutions. Edited by J. K. Fairbank. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Liu, James T. C. "The Neo-traditional Period (ca. 800-1900) in Chinese History." Journal of Asian Studies, XXIV (1964-65), pp. 105-107.

Liu, James T. C. Ou-yang Hsiu. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1967.

Liu, James T. C. Reform in Sung China. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Liu Ts'un-yan. "The Three Teachings in the Mongol-yüan Times." Unpublished paper presented at the Columbia University Regional Seminar on Neo-Confucian Studies, Jan., 1978.

Lo, Winston Wan. The Life and Thought of Yeh Shih. Gainesville: University Presses of Florida, and Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 1974.

Lu K'uan Yü (Charles Luk). Ch'an and Zen Teaching. 3rd series; London: Rider and Co., 1962.

McKnight, Brian E. "Administrators of Hangchow under the Northern Sung: A Case Study." Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, XXX (1970), pp. 185-211.

McKnight, Brian E. Village and Bureaucracy in Southern Sung China. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Metzger, Thomas. Escape From Predicament. New York: Columbia University Press, 1976.

Miyakawa, Hisayuki. "An Outline of the Naito Hypothesis and its Effects on Japanese Studies of China." Far Eastern Quarterly, XIV (1954-55), pp. 533-34.

Nishimura, Eshin. "On Taishi, the Great Death in Zen Experience." Zengaku kenkyū, LIII (July, 1963), pp. 1-8.

Sasaki, Ruth Fuller. "The History of the Koan in Rinzai (Lin-chi) Zen." The Zen Koan. Co-authored by Isshu Miura and Ruth Fuller Sasaki. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1965.

Sasaki, Ruth Fuller; Iriya Yoshitaka; Fraser, Dana; and Kazuhiro Furuta. The Recorded Sayings of Ch'an Master Lin-chi Hui-chao of Chen Prefecture. Kyoto: The Institute for Zen Studies, 1975.

Śhiba Yoshinobu. Commerce and Society in Sung China. Michigan Abstracts of Chinese and Japanese Works on Chinese History, No. 2. Translated by Mark Elvin. Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan, 1970.

Śiren, Osvald. The Chinese on the Art of Painting. New York: Schocken Books, 1963.

Soothill, W. E. and Hodous, Lewis. A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., Ltd., 1937.

Spiro, Melford. Buddhist and Society. New York: and Evanston, Ill.: Harper and Row, 1970.

Streng, Frederick J. Emptiness - A Study in Religious Meaning. Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1967.

Suzuki, Daisetz Teitaro. An Introduction to Zen Buddhism. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1949.

Suzuki, Daisetz Teitaro. Essays in Zen Buddhism, Second Series. Revised edition. London: Rider and Co., 1970. First published in London by Luzoc and Co., 1933.

Suzuki, Daisetz Teitaro. Living by Zen. Tokyo: Sanseido, 1949.

Takakusu, Junjirō. The Essentials of Buddhist Philosophy. 3rd ed. Honolulu: Office Appliance Co., Ltd., 1956.

Thurman, Robert A. F., trans. The Holy Teaching of Vimalakīrti. University Park, Pa. and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1976.

Tokiwa Gishin. "The '信不及' (Shin Fugyū) as Expounded in the Lankāvatāra." Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū (Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies, XXIV, No. 1 (Dec., 1975), pp. 508-13.

Tu Wei-ming. Centrality and Commonality. Monographs of the Society for Asian and Comparative Philosophy, No. 3. Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii, 1976.

Twitchett, Denis. "Chinese Social History from the Seventh to the Tenth Centuries." Past and Present, No. 35 (Dec., 1966), pp. 28-53.

White, Douglass Alan. "Interpretations of the Central Concept of the I-ching during the Han, Sung and Ming Dynasties." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1976.

Wiens, Harold J. Han Chinese Expansion in South China. Hamden, Conn.: The Shoestring Press, Inc., 1967. First published as China's March Toward the Tropics, 1954.

Wilhelm, Richard, trans. The I Ching or Book of Changes. Translated from German by Cary F. Baynes. 3rd. ed., Bollinpen Series, XIX; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.

Williamson, H. R. Wang An-shih. London: Arthur Probosthain, 1937.

Wright, Hope. Alphabetical List of Geographical Names in Sung China. Paris, École Pratique des Hautes Études, 1956.

Yampolsky, Philip B. The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.

Yampolsky, Philip B. The Zen Master Hakuin: Selected Writings. New York: Columbia University Press, 1971.

Zürcher, E. The Buddhist Conquest of China. Leyden: E. J. Brill & Co., 1959.

Summary

This thesis explores several important aspects of the teaching and career of the Southern Sung Ch'an monk Ta-hui Tsung-kao 大慧宗杲 (1089-1163). Ta-hui made significant contributions to Chinese intellectual and religious history, and to the development of the Ch'an and Zen traditions. Further, Ta-hui's education, interests and concerns epitomize those of the Sung Ch'an movement and the wider Sung Buddhist movement of his time. It is the contention of this dissertation that Ta-hui's major contributions can be more fully understood if they are seen in the context of his active concern to make Ch'an enlightenment and insight available to the educated lay men and women (<u>shih-tai-fu</u> 士大夫).

In Chapter I a short summary of the major events in Ta-hui's life is given, and the circumstances surrounding Ta-hui's exile at the the height of his career are explored. At issue is the question of whether Ta-hui can be said to have contributed to the Ch'an-Zen tradition a model for righteous political action and social concern. Ta-hui appears at the very least to have conceived of his role as Ch'an teacher not as one of withdrawal from "the world" but as one of dynamic contribution to "the world."

In Chapter II the relation between Ta-hui and ideas and persons associated with the growing "<u>Tao-hsüeh</u>" movement in the early Southern Sung is explored. Here it is suggested Ta-hui's concern for teaching educated lay men and women to seek enlightenment required of him a

response to the spiritual and intellectual concerns, aspirations and approaches of educated Confucians. As it happened, many of his lay students of record were associated with what was later known as the Tao-hsüeh movement, and were followers of the Ch'eng brothers who had led the movement in the previous century. Ta-hui apparently responded sympathetically to this movement, and may have influenced leading teachers and writers on the "left wing" of the Tao-hsüeh movement.

In Chapters III and IV Ta-hui's contributions to "Three Teachings" thought are discussed. Here again Ta-hui's openness to truth in the teaching, practice and realization of Taoists and Confucians is seen in the context of his larger concern to clarify the path to enlightenment for laymen. It is suggested that it perhaps was the concerns and aspirations of the Tao-hsüeh movement in particular that convinced Ta-hui to move beyond the positions taken by earlier Buddhist proponents of the idea that the "Three Teachings" are essentially one. Earlier writers had concentrated on the similarities of the ethical teachings of the three traditions; Ta-hui suggested that the three traditions used different language to refer to similar processes of internal cultivation.

In Chapter V it is suggested that Ta-hui may have developed a particular sermon form into an instrument for the teaching of laymen. One particular sermon is discussed in order to show the way in which Ta-hui wove together two levels of truth in a sermon given to make merit for the deceased daughter of a lay patron. On one level he used

the traditional notions of karmic causality and rebirth both to comfort the bereaved and to arouse motivation to seek an enlightenment which would transcend karmic bonds. On another level he skillfully led his hearers to understand that death and rebirth understood as karmic events were ultimately "empty," and that the meaning of death could be understood only by the enlightened mind. Thus he both exercised compassionate concern for the immediate needs of his lay hearers, and attempted to show them the path of enlightenment *in and through* their "mundane" attachments and emotions.

In Chapter VI Ta-hui's interest in the *Hua-yen sūtra*, and his response to the teaching of the universality of the Buddha's enlightenment contained in the *Hua-yen sūtra* and advocated by the Hua-yen school, are explored. It is suggested that Ta-hui's interest in the sūtra and the school were typical of Ch'an teachers of his time, but may further be related to his desire to show laymen that enlightenment was as available to a layman in the world as to a monk in retreat.

Chapters VII and VIII discuss Ta-hui's greatest contribution to the development of the Ch'an tradition, namely, his teaching about the importance of a moment of breakthrough into enlightenment and about the role of doubt as force that could be focused through *hua-t'ou* or *kung-an* practice to bring about such a moment of enlightenment. Once again it is suggested that one reason why Ta-hui insisted on the value of *hua-t'ou* practice toward a moment of enlightenment was that Ta-hui believed that *hua-t'ou* practice, unlike other rival methods, could be carried out in the midst of lay daily life, as it did not require an

undisturbed environment in order to facilitate absence of thought. It seems that Ta-hui may well have believed that hua-t'ou practice was not only the most effective path to Buddhahood, it was the only form of practice through which the insight of enlightenment could be brought to bear on the culture of educated laymen and thus indirectly upon the political, social and cultural crises of the time to which only educated laymen were in a position to respond.